

The Resources Agency of California  
WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD  
Minutes, Meeting of July 17, 1964

\* \* \* \* \*

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. Crescent City Coastal Angling Access, Del Norte Co. . .	3 - 4
5. Morro Bay Coastal Angling Access, S.Luis Obispo Co. . .	4 - 5
6. Ventura Marina Reef, Ventura Co. . . . .	5 - 7
7. Reading Island Angling Access, Shasta Co. . . . .	7 - 8
8. Samoa Peninsula Coastal Angling Access, Humboldt Co. . .	8 - 9
9. Bridgeport Reservoir Angling Access, Mono Co. . . . .	10 - 12
10. Humboldt Bay Tributaries Stream Clearance, Humboldt Co.	12 - 13
11. Approval of Report of WCB Activities . . . . .	13
12. Ocean Beach Public Fishing Pier, San Diego . . . . .	13 - 16
13. Vallejo Public Fishing Pier, Solano Co. . . . .	16 - 18
14. Delta-Mendota Canal Angling Access, Stanislaus Co. . .	18 - 19
15. Proposed Abalone Hatchery . . . . .	20
16. Next WCB Meeting . . . . .	20
17. Proposed Hatchery at Sucker Springs, Shasta Co. . . . .	20
18. Parks and Recreational Bond Act Program . . . . .	20 - 24
19. Steamboat Slough Access, Sacramento County . . . . .	24 - 25
Status of Funds . . . . .	26

The Resources Agency of California  
WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD  
Minutes, Meeting of July 17, 1964

Pursuant to the call of the Chairman, the Wildlife Conservation Board met in Room B109, State Office Building, 1350 Front Street, San Diego, California, on July 17, 1964. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Henry Clineschmidt at 1:45 p.m.

1. Roll Call

PRESENT: Henry Clineschmidt  
W. T. Shannon  
Jack Halpin

Chairman  
Member  
Member, Vice Hale Champion

Senator Vernon L. Sturgeon  
Senator Aaron W. Quick  
Assemblyman Frank P. Belotti  
Assemblyman Wm. E. Dannemeyer  
Assemblywoman Pauline Davis

Joint Interim Committee  
" " "  
" " "  
" " "  
" " "

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

Executive Officer  
Assistant Executive Officer  
Field Agent  
Secretary

ABSENT: Senator John C. Begovich

Joint Interim Committee

OTHERS PRESENT:

Keith E. Kelly  
L. E. Earnest  
Tom F. Ham, Jr.  
Ray Burke  
Walter B. Cain  
N. Edward Denton  
Floyd H. Morgan  
Arnold Rummelsburg  
Benno L. Heune  
Tom Wagner  
John G. Ginos  
Thomas J. R. Smith  
Stewart M. Angus  
James W. Dougherty  
Ethel H. Dougherty  
Mrs. R. J. Nesbit  
Mrs. Aaron W. Quick  
Mrs. Frank P. Belotti  
Phillip Marquart  
Kenneth A. Montieth  
Alex Calhoun  
Edward Doyle

Greater Vallejo Recreation District  
City of San Diego  
Peninsula Chamber of Commerce  
Mono County  
Supervisor, Mono County  
District Attorney, Mono County  
Supervisor, Shasta County  
Shasta County  
Bridgeport  
San Diego Co. Wildlife Federation  
Pres., San Diego Co. Wildlife Fed.  
Ocean Beach  
Commissioner-Sec., Ventura Port Dist.  
San Diego  
" "  
Sacramento  
El Centro  
Eureka  
Stanislaus County  
Stanislaus County  
Dept. of Fish and Game  
Pres., Chamber of Commerce, Morro Bay

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
July 17, 1964

Kendall Jenkins	Harbor Mgr., San Luis Obispo Co.
Thomas H. Wilson	San Diego
R. C. Dorland	Engineers, San Diego
George Lykos	Architect, San Diego
Si Nathenson	Dept. of Fish and Game
W. C. Dry	" " "
Frank Curran	Mayor, San Diego
C. E. Porter	City of San Diego

2. Approval of Minutes

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. HALPIN, AS A JOINT MOTION, THAT THE MINUTES OF THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD MEETING OF MARCH 12, 1964, BE APPROVED AS WRITTEN.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Status of Funds: The amount allocated to projects as of the close of the meeting on March 12, 1964, aggregated \$18,577,324.00\*.

a. Fish Hatchery and Stocking Projects . . . . .	\$4,434,499.31
b. Fish Habitat Development and Improvement Projects . . . . .	2,549,232.73
1. Reservoir Construction or Improvement . . . \$1,434,608.19	
2. Stream Clearance and Improvement . . . . .	159,470.98
3. Stream Flow Maintenance Dams . . . . .	439,503.32
4. Marine Habitat . . . . .	74,697.09
5. Fish Screens, Ladders, & Weir Projects . . . . .	440,953.15
c. Angling Access Projects . . . . .	4,792,571.34
1. Coastal Access . . . . .	624,080.86
2. River, Stream and Bay Access . . . . .	1,047,689.28
3. Lake, Reservoir and Salton Sea Access . . . . .	1,686,445.94
4. Piers . . . . .	1,434,355.26
d. Game Farm Projects . . . . .	146,894.49
e. Game Habitat Development and Improvement Projects . . . . .	6,024,135.34
1. Waterfowl Areas . . . . .	5,515,604.50
2. Other Game . . . . .	452,530.84
3. Wildlife Management Areas . . . . .	56,000.00
f. Hunting Access . . . . .	358,193.71
g. Miscellaneous Projects . . . . .	238,297.08
Total Allocated to Specific Projects . . . . .	\$18,543,824.00
Special Project Allocations . . . . .	33,500.00
Proj. Evaluation, Property Acq. & Eng'ing Studies . . . . .	25,000.00
Program Report . . . . .	8,500.00
Total Allocated . . . . .	\$18,577,324.00

\*WCB allocated \$612,790.00 under Public Works Acceleration Program - 50% reimbursable to State from the Federal Government. (\$306,395.00)

Operating Costs:

FY 47/48 thru 62/63 Actual . . . . .	\$830,842.55
FY 63/64 Estimated . . . . .	87,143.00
Total Actual and Estimated Operating Costs . . . . .	\$917,985.55

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
July 17, 1964

Recapitulation:

Allocations for Projects . . . . .	\$18,543,824.00
Special Project Allocations . . . . .	33,500.00
Expenses of Operation . . . . .	917,985.55
Total Expended or Obligated . . . . .	\$19,495,309.55
 Total Funds Appropriated . . . . .	 \$18,750,000.00
Approp. made available 7/1/64 . . . . .	750,000.00
Int. on Surplus Money Inv. thru 12/31/63 . . . . .	697,771.95
Miscellaneous Revenue thru 62/63 . . . . .	130,297.04
Miscellaneous Revenue thru 63/64 . . . . .	1,904.32
Total Sum Available . . . . .	\$20,329,973.31
Total Expended or Obligated . . . . .	19,495,309.55
Available thru June 30, 1965 . . . . .	\$834,663.76

4. Crescent City Coastal Angling Access, Del Norte County \$15,460.00

Mr. Nesbit, Executive Officer, explained that this is one of two WCB projects which sustained damage from the tidal wave following the Alaska earthquake of March 28, 1964.

The Crescent City public fishing access project consists of a bulkhead and parking area, two boat loading derricks, loading docks, restrooms and wave baffles. The project, in operation since 1959 has been extensively used by sports fishermen, especially during the salmon season. It is the only public boat access between Eureka and the Oregon border.

For several weeks following this damage, it was believed that reconstruction costs would be borne by the Federal and State assistance funds which were allocated to the affected areas. In late May the staff learned that these WCB projects were not eligible for either Federal or State emergency funds. The Crescent City fishing access project is maintained by the Crescent City Harbor District. Their maintenance obligation includes normal repairs and replacement but does not include rebuilding in the event of "act of God" damage. The major structures held up well under the tidal waves but such facilities as the floats received considerable damage or were completely lost.

Engineering estimates have been provided by the Harbor District engineers and reviewed by the Department of Fish and Game engineers. They are as follows:

Replace 14 pipe piles, 5" diam., 30' long	
@ \$5.25 per ft. installed	\$2,205
Remove and dispose of concrete baffle	450
Reconstruct floats -	
39 pcs. styrofoam @ \$14.00	\$ 546
Collars, other hardware and labor	1,192
Replace rip-rap - 250 c.y. @ \$5.50	1,375
Remove and replace damaged pavement, 4000 sq. ft. @ \$.50	2,000
Restore restroom - doors, windows and paint	425
Replace bumper logs, 100 lineal ft. @ \$1.50	150
Piling and baffles	5,860
	<hr/> \$14,203
Contingencies	1,257
TOTAL	<hr/> \$15,460



Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
July 17, 1964

In view of the nature of the damage and the value of this project in providing ocean fishing access, Mr. Nesbit recommended that the sum of \$15,460 be allocated, and the staff and the Department of Fish and Game be authorized to proceed with the reconstruction.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, SECONDED BY SENATOR STURGEON, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE CRESCENT CITY COASTAL ANGLING ACCESS, DEL NORTE COUNTY; ALLOCATE FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND \$15,460.00 FOR THIS RECONSTRUCTION; 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. HALPIN, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE CRESCENT CITY COASTAL ANGLING ACCESS, DEL NORTE COUNTY; ALLOCATE FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND \$15,460.00 FOR THIS RECONSTRUCTION; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Morro Bay Coastal Angling Access, San Luis Obispo County \$7,700.00

This is the second WCB project sustaining damage from the tidal wave in March, 1964. It was reported by Mr. Nesbit that this access project on Morro Bay provides fishing access to both the Bay and the ocean. The project was completed and opened to public use January 6, 1962. Last year 13,200 persons used the facilities. Total expenditure by the WCB was \$21,427.00. The project is developed on land leased from the County and consists of a parking area, restroom, double launching ramp, and floating docks for loading.

The County of San Luis Obispo maintains the facilities, but their obligation does not extend to catastrophic damage such as occurred when the tidal wave hit Morro Bay on March 28. The damage was caused by the movement of the extremely fast currents which were carrying debris from broken docks, boats, and various other floating objects.

Like Crescent City, it was believed that emergency funds would cover this reconstruction. It was learned, however, that these projects did not qualify under the Federal-State programs.

The following is an estimate and cost breakdown of the work required to restore this WCB facility to its normal condition prior to the tidal wave damage.

Item	Material	Labor & Equipment
	Costs	Costs
2 Gangplanks	\$ 350	\$ 200
2 Floating Docks	1,600	400
2 Pilings	400	800
36 Concrete Logs, realign	250	2,200
Replace rip-rap material	200	600
	<u>\$2,800</u>	<u>\$4,200</u>

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
July 17, 1964

Subtotal \$7,000  
Contingencies 700  
TOTAL \$7,700

It was the staff's recommendation that an allocation of \$7,700 be made for the necessary reconstruction at this coastal angling access project, and that the staff and the Department be authorized to proceed with the work.

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR STURGEON, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYWOMAN DAVIS, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE MORRO BAY COASTAL ANGLING ACCESS, SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY; ALLOCATE FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND \$7,700 FOR THIS RECONSTRUCTION; 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. HALPIN, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE MORRO BAY COASTAL ANGLING ACCESS, SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY; ALLOCATE FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND \$7,700 FOR THIS RECONSTRUCTION; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. Ventura Marina Reef, Ventura County

\$12,000.00

Mr. Nesbit stated that an artificial reef has been proposed to improve the ocean fishing in the vicinity of the Ventura Marina offshore from the City of Ventura. Senator Robert Lagomarsino requested, through the Director of Fish and Game, that the Department investigate the feasibility of such a reef. The Commissioners of the Ventura Port District by resolution supported the idea of a reef and have agreed to maintain the buoy marker system if the reef is constructed.

Department biologist-divers investigated the proposal and recommend the project. The bottom is very barren and sandy in the area and fishing could be considerably enhanced by such a reef. The Department recommendation is as follows: "The Department believes that the construction of such a reef is important to provide improved fishing in the area concerned. This is basically a sandy bottom and the establishment of a reef should attract such fish as kelp bass, sand bass, sculpin, ocean whitefish and other species characteristic of a rocky bottom."

The reef location as selected by the divers is approximately 2.7 miles west of the Ventura Marina in 60 feet of water. Cost estimates are as follows:

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
July 17, 1964

Quarry rock, 2,000 tons	\$11,000
Buoys, chains, anchors	700
Contingencies, Dept. of General	
Services charges	300
TOTAL	\$12,000

Reefs when properly located have proven to be successful in increasing the fishing in their vicinity. The advantage to this reef as proposed is that it is in such close proximity to a large boating facility.

Mr. Nesbit recommended the approval of this project, that \$12,000 be allocated for construction, and that the staff and the Department of Fish and Game be authorized to proceed substantially as planned.

Assemblyman Dannemeyer asked if there has been an increase in the catch of fish due to the installation of reefs. Mr. Nesbit replied that although there are no poundage figures available, it has been found that the reefs attract fish to an area where previously there were no fish populations. Sport fishing boats in the ocean very often come back to the reefs to fill out their catch. He explained that 8 reefs have been constructed by the Board and two are awaiting construction. One of these is a pier reef at Imperial Beach pier. Fishermen who use the pier frequently feel there is a 15 to 20% increase in fish since placement of the reef and that new species, such as the sand bass which had not previously been caught, are found in the vicinity. Mr. Nesbit brought out the fact that the purpose of the program is to develop reefs in areas of sandy bottom which lack fish populations.

Mr. Stewart Angus of the Ventura Port District, the cooperators on this project, stated that this is one of the reasons for the interest in a reef project off the Ventura coastline. The Santa Barbara coastline boasts kelp; however, the Ventura coast is sandy for 3 or 4 miles out and there is no vegetation where the fish can get protection. He felt a reef project on the Ventura coast would prove successful and that it would support fish that would not otherwise be available.

Assemblywoman Davis asked if the construction of reefs has brought in additional revenue to the Department and what percentage of increase has been noted in this regard. Mr. Shannon replied that this has been very difficult to determine and stated he could not estimate the revenue attributable to reefs. He advised that the Department has also put in reefs and has studied them. A report has recently been published on this study which included many underwater photographs. Mr. Clineschmidt requested that this report be made available to all Board members.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, SECONDED BY SENATOR STURGEON, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE VENTURA MARINA REEF, VENTURA COUNTY; ALLOCATE \$12,000 FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND TO THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME FOR ITS DEVELOPMENT; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO PROCEED AS OUTLINED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
July 17, 1964

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. HALPIN, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE VENTURA MARINA REEF, VENTURA COUNTY; ALLOCATE \$12,000 FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND TO THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME FOR ITS DEVELOPMENT; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO PROCEED AS OUTLINED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. Reading Island Angling Access, Shasta County \$107,000.00

Chairman Clineschmidt asked that the Board consider the Reading Island Angling Access proposal in compliance with a request by the Shasta County representatives.

Mr. Nesbit advised that this project was previewed at the March 12, 1964, meeting. Refined cost estimates were not available at that time but the proposed development was outlined. Staff was instructed to work with Shasta County officials to prepare plans and cost estimates. These have now been prepared and the project is ready for Board consideration.

This site, formerly known as Goat Island, was selected during the 1956 Wildlife Conservation Board survey of the Sacramento River. It is located on a reach of the river where there is good fishing and poor public access. It will not only provide fishing access on the west bank of the Sacramento River, but it will provide more than one mile of shoreline fishing as well. This 41 acre parcel of land is the southern end of an island in the river at the mouth of Anderson Creek.

The land is owned by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management. State interest will be obtained by lease or cooperative agreement with BLM and Shasta County.

The proposed project would consist of an access road, a bridge across Anderson Creek, an access road on the island, parking area, launching ramp, loading dock, sanitary facilities and fencing. In addition to these basic facilities the County plans to eventually develop camping areas and other overnight use facilities.

Shasta County has agreed to maintain the area when it is completed and to keep it free to the public. Much interest has developed in this project since it was first proposed in 1956.

Staff has received endorsements of the project from the Anderson-Cottonwood Chamber of Commerce, the Shasta-Cascade Wonderland Association, Senator Edwin Regan and others.

The engineering cost estimates were jointly prepared by County engineers and the Department of Fish and Game engineering section. These are as follows:

Access Roads	\$16,100
Bridge across Anderson Creek	40,600
Launching ramp and loading dock	10,000
Parking area	22,500
Water supply - domestic	1,500
Sanitary facilities	1,000
Fencing	1,500
Contingencies, signs, title costs, etc.	13,800
-7-	<u>\$107,000</u> TOTAL



Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
July 17, 1964

Mr. Nesbit recommended the approval of this project, that \$107,000 be allocated for development and that the staff and the Department be authorized to proceed with the project substantially as planned.

Supervisor Floyd Morgan of Shasta County pointed out the high local interest in this proposal and expressed the opinion that the funds would provide an excellent fishing access for the area.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYWOMAN DAVIS, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE READING ISLAND ANGLING ACCESS, SHASTA COUNTY; ALLOCATE FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND \$107,000.00 FOR ITS DEVELOPMENT; 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. HALPIN, SECONDED BY MR. SHANNON, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE READING ISLAND ANGLING ACCESS, SHASTA COUNTY; ALLOCATE FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND \$107,000.00 FOR ITS DEVELOPMENT; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Arnold Rummelsburg, Director of Water Resources for Shasta County, thanked the Board for its approval of the Reading Island access project.

8. Samoa Peninsula Coastal Angling Access, Humboldt County \$7,000.00

At the meeting of August 8, 1963, the staff was instructed to investigate and report back to the Board on the proposal to acquire the old Humboldt Bay Lifeboat Station near Eureka as a public fishing access site. Staff reported at the November 15, 1963, meeting that a portion of the surplus property appeared very desirable as a fishing access area, and that a definite staff recommendation would be submitted upon the General Services Administration determining the selling price.

Mr. Nesbit identified the portion of the lifeboat station under consideration by the Board. It was shown as that portion southeast of the county road in Parcel I as platted on U.S. Coast Guard Drawing No. C-490-1-0, Civil Engineering Branch files, 12th CG District, San Francisco, California, and being a portion of Lot 5, Section 32, Township 5 North, Range 1 West, Humboldt Meridian, situated on Humboldt Bay North Spit, vicinity of Fair Haven, County of Humboldt, State of California, and which contains 12.95 acres.

G.S.A. has recently informed us that the appraised value of the 12.95 acre parcel is \$12,940, and that it may be purchased for a 50% discount, or \$6,470, by the State for use as a public recreational area.



Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
July 17, 1964

This surplus parcel provides the closest and safest small boat launching site for public access to the mouth of Humboldt Bay and the excellent salmon and other fishing in nearby ocean waters. The property is served by a paved county road which makes it easily accessible from the Eureka-Arcata area and Highways 101 and 299. A paved apron for a former seaplane base could be readily adapted for parking.

Sportsmen in the past launched boats successfully from the old wooden seaplane ramp, which no longer is useable due to decay and to erosion of the approach area. Preliminary engineering studies indicate that construction of a concrete ramp and riprap of the shoreline area to halt erosion will provide an excellent access facility for small boat fishing.

The WCB project completed in 1961 at Fields Landing on south Humboldt has already been over-taxed by public useage. Mr. Nesbit indicated that the Samoa Peninsula site will satisfy a well demonstrated need for additional small boat access to these waters, particularly shorter and safer passage to the ocean and to the north bay area.

Mr. Nesbit recommended that this surplus property be purchased at this time, and that an allocation for development be held in abeyance until more detailed engineering studies, plans and cost estimates can be made.

The Board of Supervisors of Humboldt County by resolution has supported WCB acquisition of the property, and have indicated willingness to assume operation and maintenance of facilities developed there.

The allocation of \$7,000 for land purchase and related costs and authorization for staff and the Department of Fish and Game to proceed with the acquisition was recommended by Mr. Nesbit.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYWOMAN DAVIS, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE SAMOA PENINSULA COASTAL ANGLING ACCESS, HUMBOLDT COUNTY; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO PURCHASE FROM GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION FOR USE AS A PUBLIC RECREATIONAL AREA THE 12.95 ACRE PARCEL IDENTIFIED BY THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER, FOR WHICH PURPOSE THE SUM OF \$7,000 IS HEREBY ALLOCATED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. HALPIN, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE SAMOA PENINSULA COASTAL ANGLING ACCESS, HUMBOLDT COUNTY; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO PURCHASE FROM GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION FOR USE AS A PUBLIC RECREATIONAL AREA THE 12.95 ACRE PARCEL IDENTIFIED BY THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER, FOR WHICH PURPOSE THE SUM OF \$7,000 IS HEREBY ALLOCATED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
July 17, 1964

9. Bridgeport Reservoir Angling Access, Mono County \$69,500.00

Mr. Nesbit advised that this project was proposed by Mono County with the support of local organizations. Bridgeport Reservoir is an impoundment of the Walker River Irrigation District and is located on the East Walker River immediately north of the town of Bridgeport. The reservoir is approximately four miles long and two miles wide with a surface area of 2,600 acres.

The Department of Fish and Game states that Bridgeport Reservoir is unusually productive for trout. Planted fingerling and subcatchable rainbow trout put on rapid growth, and the reservoir also maintains an excellent self-sustaining population of brown trout. The W.R.I.D. has entered into an agreement with the Department to maintain a minimum pool for protection of fishlife, and to allow free public access for hunting and fishing.

To date public access has been limited to an area between Highway 22 and the eastern shore of the reservoir. Private lands have blocked public access, except by boat, to other parts of the reservoir and to adjoining public lands of both the U.S. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management.

The proposed project consists essentially of constructing approximately 2.5 miles of access road leaving Highway 22 north of the lake and developing public fishing access facilities at the road terminus on the westerly shoreline.

The proposed project would produce several-fold benefits:

1. Open the western shoreline of the lake to shore fishing and considerably improve access for boat fishing.
2. Open the western shore to waterfowl hunting, which is rated good for both ducks and geese.
3. Improve access to fishing in the East Walker River below the dam.
4. Open 8,000 or more acres of public lands northerly of the reservoir to excellent hunting for deer, sage grouse, chukars, mountain quail and rabbits.

Heavy use of the project is anticipated, primarily by southern Californians. Ninety-five percent of the recreational use in Mono County is by visitors from southern California.

The County of Mono has agreed to acquire the necessary road right-of-way across private lands and the fishing access site from BLM to provide these areas on a free lease basis for WCB development, and to operate and maintain the project free to the public.

Plans and cost estimates prepared by the County of Mono and reviewed and approved by staff and the Fish and Game engineering section are as follows:

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
July 17, 1964

Road - approximately 2.5 miles - grading, culverts and cattle guards	\$39,800
Parking area - clear and grade approximately $\frac{1}{2}$ acre	2,000
Ramp - 2 lane concrete	10,000
Sanitary facilities and water system	10,200
Fencing	2,500
	<hr/> 64,500
Contingencies, signs, etc.	5,000
TOTAL	<hr/> \$69,500

Mr. Nesbit recommended that this project be approved, that \$69,500 be allocated for development, and that staff and the Department of Fish and Game be authorized to proceed with the project substantially as planned. He stated that a number of letters and telegrams supporting this proposal has been received from organizations and individuals. Just prior to the meeting, the staff was apprised of correspondence requesting deferral of the project. A telegram from the Southern Council of Conservation Clubs informed the Board that a survey team plans to look over the area this weekend to determine if this proposal would hurt the hunting of waterfowl. It was Mr. Nesbit's opinion that this project would enhance the hunting, and that probably the person raising the question was not familiar with the location.

In answer to Assemblywoman Davis' question relative to planting of fish in the reservoir, Mr. Shannon replied that the Department plants fish there regularly.

Mr. Ray Burke, Director of Parks and Recreation of Mono County, referred to statistics that 1,100,000 boats are expected in California in 35 years, and that the project would be a step in the right direction. He advised that this project was brought to the attention of the WCB staff over a year ago and considerable planning was done on the proposal. This was then presented by him to the Bridgeport Chamber of Commerce, and they voted to support the project. He further pointed out that the letter written on Mono County Chamber of Commerce letterhead which requests deferral of the project is actually an individual letter from the president of the Chamber and does not represent the thinking of the Chamber itself.

Supervisor Walter Cain of Mono County advised that the Mono County Board of Supervisors has considered this proposal for over a year and is very much in favor of the project.

Senator Quick reported that he has received a letter from Senator Wm. Symons indicating that he is very much in favor of this project. Senator Symons felt it was an area that needed recreational money and a project which would benefit all the people of California.

Mr. Edward Denton, District Attorney of Mono County, added his support to the project and pointed out that as more and more people come into the county for recreation, they must have a place to go without trespassing on private lands.

Mr. Benno Heune, a business operator at Bridgeport Reservoir, spoke in opposition to the proposal and presented a letter of protest from the Walker River Irrigation District dated July 6, 1964. The District expressed concern that



Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
July 17, 1964

construction and public use of the project would cause problems of sanitation, trash and erosion, would interfere with private enterprise, and was otherwise unsuitable.

Mr. Heune elaborated on the various points raised by the Walker River Irrigation District. He stated in answer to Chairman Clineschmidt's question that this proposal would not be in competition with his business since he also has free launching and parking facilities. His business consists of selling tackle and renting boats. It was his feeling that this project proposes access to an area where there is no need. Mr. Heune expressed the fear that opening up the other side of the lake would encourage trail bikes causing ruts to be put in which would eventually develop a delta area in the reservoir.

Mr. Nesbit informed the Board the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management have cooperated with the staff on this project and both recommend it. He also advised that both the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management have measures to control erosion if it is a real concern.

In regard to maintenance of the area, Mr. Nesbit assured the Board that the County of Mono has agreed by resolution to maintenance of the project according to their standards.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYWOMAN DAVIS, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE BRIDGEPORT RESERVOIR ANGLING ACCESS, MONO COUNTY; ALLOCATE FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND \$69,500 FOR ITS DEVELOPMENT; 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. HALPIN, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE BRIDGEPORT RESERVOIR ANGLING ACCESS, MONO COUNTY; ALLOCATE FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND \$69,500 FOR ITS DEVELOPMENT; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

10. Humboldt Bay Tributaries Stream Clearance, Humboldt County \$32,700.00

Mr. Nesbit advised that this project is a continuation of the stream clearance program approved by the Wildlife Conservation Board in September, 1960.

Proposed for clearance work under this project are the following streams tributary to Humboldt Bay: Freshwater Creek and tributaries, the North and South Forks of Elk River and Salmon Creek. Clearance work would make available or improve 34 miles of these streams which are considered to be potentially among the best silver salmon producers on the California coast. Clearance would be followed by three consecutive annual plants of yearling salmon which should greatly improve the fishery in Humboldt Bay and the ocean.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
July 17, 1964

Detailed surveys of these streams have been made by the Department of Fish and Game which has also investigated responsibility for the log jams. It has been determined that existing owners have no legal responsibility to remove the jams.

Clearance work would be carried out by inmate labor from the Division of Forestry's High Rock Conservation Camp. The work schedule is estimated for three years, with two years of clearance work and one of follow-up.

Cost estimates prepared by the Department are as follows:

Labor, inmate	\$29,018
Equipment rental	500
Materials and supplies	200
Contingencies	2,982
TOTAL	\$32,700

Staff recommendation was that this project be approved, that \$32,700 be allocated for stream clearance, and that the Department and staff be authorized to proceed with the project.

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR QUICK, SECONDED BY SENATOR STURGEON, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE HUMBOLDT BAY TRIBUTARIES STREAM CLEARANCE, HUMBOLDT COUNTY; ALLOCATE \$32,700 TO THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. HALPIN, SECONDED BY MR. SHANNON, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE HUMBOLDT BAY TRIBUTARIES STREAM CLEARANCE, HUMBOLDT COUNTY; ALLOCATE \$32,700 TO THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

11. Approval of Report of WCB Activities

Chairman Clineschmidt called attention to the recent publication entitled "A Report of the Activities of the Wildlife Conservation Board 1947-1963." This report was authorized by Board action on November 15, 1963. Chairman Clineschmidt stated that he had heard many favorable comments on the report and wished to go on record as commending staff responsible for the report. By acclamation the Board approved the report.

12. Ocean Beach Public Fishing Pier

\$275,000.00

Mr. Nesbit related that at the March 12, 1964, meeting the WCB passed the motion which did "approve in principle the development of a pier under the WCB Pier Policy at Ocean Beach, San Diego, in lieu of the Pt. Loma Pier, and that the entire allocation of \$145,000 for the Pt. Loma Pier be transferred to the



Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
July 17, 1964

proposed Ocean Beach Pier. The sum of \$20,000, which is to be matched by the City of San Diego, is hereby authorized for use from the \$145,000 to obtain engineering plans and cost estimates for a pier at Ocean Beach."

On April 16, 1964, a four-man selection board consisting of two persons from the City of San Diego and two from the State, engaged the San Diego firm of Ferver and Dorland, associated with Lykos and Goldhammer, to design the pier and provide cost estimates.

The San Diego City Council approved the project on February 27, 1964, and agreed to provide 50% of the engineering and construction costs in accordance with the WCB pier policy.

The City has further agreed to provide the necessary parking areas and to maintain the fishing pier free to the public when completed.

The design engineers were instructed to design a structure for a long life -- in excess of 75 years. They were asked to provide maximum rail space for use by fishermen and to locate the pier to take advantage of the best fish habitat conditions.

Divers have reported good bottom conditions for fish and the presence of large fish and lobster populations.

On June 24, 1964, the staff met with the design engineers and City of San Diego officials to review the designs and cost estimates. All parties were in agreement that an adequate structure could be constructed for a cost of \$800,000. This would include matching of \$400,000 by each agency. With a previous allocation of \$125,000 made March 12, 1964, there remains a total of \$275,000 required from the WCB for final project approval.

Mr. Nesbit recommended the approval of the project and the allocation of necessary funds for development. He advised that the design engineers were present and would be able to answer any questions relative to design.

Assemblyman Dannemeyer inquired as to the present status of the construction trestle at Pt. Loma and was advised that it had been torn down.

Mayor Frank Curran expressed appreciation for the opportunity to show the Wildlife Conservation Board his City and those areas of particular interest to the Board and the City, so that misinformation of any kind relative to the trestle can be corrected. His own personal observations were that the matter was resolved in the best interest of the City of San Diego. He did not see the Ocean Beach pier proposal as a compromise, since he felt the creation of a more permanent pier was only good judgment. He gave some background information on piers in San Diego and the interest of the City in locating fishing piers there. The reasons for deciding on a pier in Ocean Beach rather than utilizing the Pt. Loma construction trestle were thoroughly explained. He cited the advantages of a pier at Ocean Beach as follows:

1. It can be open 24 hours each day the entire year.
2. It can be designed as a fishing pier with high safety values and low maintenance.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
July 17, 1964

3. It is located in excellent fishing waters.
4. It can be reached from anywhere in the City by public transportation and is immediately accessible to a large segment of the City's population.
5. It will provide an economic stimulant to the Ocean Beach community.
6. Adequate parking space can be made available.
7. It has the enthusiastic support of the general public.

Mayor Curran reiterated that the City of San Diego supports the idea of a fishing pier and at this location. He expressed his appreciation to the Board and staff and the various agencies which have supplied the City guidance and information, and stated he looked forward to a partnership with the Board in providing one of the finest public fishing facilities in the State of California.

Mr. Tom Ham, representing the Peninsula Chamber of Commerce, expressed the hope that the Board would look with favor on the Ocean Beach site for a pier.

Assemblyman Dannemeyer felt that he could not justifiably agree to spend \$275,000 of additional public monies to provide a facility which might have been available for purchase at \$125,000, but which was recently torn down.

Mr. Ham explained that there would be limited parking at the Pt. Loma site. It would also eliminate useage by those people who have to travel on public transportation. The hours of use would be limited also. He felt that because of these limiting factors, the cost per user would be a great deal more at Pt. Loma, and that this is an important factor to be considered.

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR QUICK, SECONDED BY SENATOR STURGEON, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE ENGINEERING PLANS FOR THE OCEAN BEACH PUBLIC FISHING PIER, SAN DIEGO; ALLOCATE \$275,000 TO BE ADDED TO THE \$145,000 PREVIOUSLY ALLOCATED TO MEET THE STATE'S SHARE OF THE COST OF THE PIER; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED.

AYES: Senator Quick, Senator Sturgeon, Assemblywoman Davis

Assemblyman Belotti

NOES: Assemblyman Dannemeyer

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. HALPIN, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE ENGINEERING PLANS FOR THE OCEAN BEACH PUBLIC FISHING PIER, SAN DIEGO; ALLOCATE \$275,000 TO BE ADDED TO THE \$145,000 PREVIOUSLY ALLOCATED TO MEET THE STATE'S SHARE OF THE COST OF THE PIER; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
July 17, 1964

Mr. Nesbit explained that \$125,000 was estimated originally for the purchase of the Pt. Loma construction trestle. Conversion costs would have been additional and as negotiations progressed, the conversion estimates became higher because of the structural and Navy requirements imposed. The pier which was designed for Ocean Beach is a permanent type of concrete with a minimum life of 75 years.

Mr. Lykos of the engineering firm advised, in answer to Mr. Halpin and Mr. Belotti's questions, that the materials to be used in the Ocean Beach pier are designed for higher stresses not possible in the piers constructed twenty or 30 years ago, and that the life expectancy of the wooden structure at Imperial Beach is 30 years.

13. Vallejo Public Fishing Pier, Solano County \$1,000.00

Mr. Nesbit related that at the November 9, 1961, meeting, the proposal to acquire the Highway 48 bridge across the Napa River at Vallejo was discussed. The bridge is presently being replaced with a new one and the old low level bridge appeared to have possibilities for conversion to a fishing pier. The Board instructed staff to study this idea and to report back.

At the March 15, 1962, meeting the executive officer reported that studies indicated the bridge was sound enough for conversion to a walk-on fishing pier and that negotiations were proceeding with the Division of Highways.

During 1964 construction was started on the new bridge, and it is scheduled for completion by late 1965.

Last month the Division of Highways indicated that they would sell the bridge to the WCB along with a parcel of land at the approach. Their appraisal price is a very nominal \$191.00 which includes a 0.19 acre triangular-shaped piece of land at the foot of the bridge and which was indicated in red on the map displayed by Mr. Nesbit.

The conversion of this bridge to a pier will provide pier fishing in the very popular striped bass waters of the Napa River at Mare Island and within the city limits of Vallejo. It is expected that, like the Berkeley Pier, considerable use of this project will be by children and older citizens.

Final engineering design and cost estimates for the conversion and necessary facilities have not been completed. However, preliminary estimates are available to give an idea of both the scope and cost of the development. These features for conversion would include parking area paving, restrooms, utilities as well as railing and other repairs. The preliminary estimate indicates these can be accomplished for less than \$50,000.

The Department of Fish and Game points out that "fishing is excellent in this area and access sites are at a very minimum level. This would furnish considerable recreational potential for Bay area and Vallejo-Napa area people. Runs of stripers and consistently good warmwater fishing could be utilized to better advantage by acquisition of the bridge."



Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
July 17, 1964

The Vallejo Rod and Gun Club and other civic organizations have expressed their support of this proposal. Senator Luther Gibson has been helpful in arranging meetings with appropriate Division of Highways officials and civic leaders. The Greater Vallejo Recreation District will be the sponsoring agency and will operate and maintain the pier when completed. In addition, they plan to provide the necessary additional parking.

Mr. Nesbit recommended the Board approve the project in principle and allocate \$1,000 for purchase of the property from the Division of Highways. Upon completion of final engineering designs, the project is to be submitted to the WCB for final approval and allocation. Mr. Nesbit added that appraisals, title reports and other title information are necessary in acquisitions and the additional sum has been requested therefor. As is usual in all projects, any surplus sum would revert to the fund.

Assemblywoman Davis stated that the Division of Highways has many staff people trained in title research. She asked why they could not furnish this service to us. Mr. Nesbit replied that according to statutory requirements, we must first have proprietary interest in the lands upon which improvements are to be made. We cannot secure title information from the owners of the land but must secure this from a title company which provides us with the title search and title insurance.

The policy of a state agency charging for services rendered another state agency, as well as the policy of a state agency selling surplus property to another state agency at the current market value rather than at the original purchase price, was discussed by the Board members. It was Mr. Halpin's suggestion that this matter not be disputed here, but rather deliberated by those responsible, inasmuch as this is not merely policy, but a provision of the government code. Senator Sturgeon agreed with this and suggested the legislative fact-finding committee would be the proper place for this discussion.

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR QUICK, SECONDED BY SENATOR STURGEON,  
THAT THE ABOVE-MENTIONED POLICIES BE DISCUSSED IN EXECUTIVE  
SESSION OF THE LEGISLATURE.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

The Chairman requested that the executive officer direct an inquiry to the Director of the Department of Finance as to what his feelings are in regard to recommending a change in existing statutes as it relates to charging agencies for services supplied in state transactions, and to transmit the reply to each of the Board members.

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR QUICK, SECONDED BY SENATOR STURGEON,  
THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSER-  
VATION BOARD APPROVE IN PRINCIPLE THE VALLEJO PUBLIC FISHING  
PIER, SOLANO COUNTY; ALLOCATE THE SUM OF \$1,000 FOR ACQUISITION  
FROM THE DIVISION OF HIGHWAYS OF THE HIGHWAY 48 BRIDGE AND THE  
0.19 ACRE PARCEL AT THE FOOT OF THE BRIDGE; AND AUTHORIZE THE  
STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO PROCEED WITH THE  
ACQUISITION.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
July 17, 1964

AYES: Senator Quick, Senator Sturgeon, Assemblywoman Davis,  
Assemblyman Pelotti

NOES: Assemblyman Dannemeyer

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. HALPIN, SECONDED BY MR. SHANNON, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE IN PRINCIPLE THE VALLEJO PUBLIC FISHING PIER, SOLANO COUNTY; ALLOCATE THE SUM OF \$1,000 FOR ACQUISITION FROM THE DIVISION OF HIGHWAYS OF THE HIGHWAY 48 BRIDGE AND THE 0.19 ACRE PARCEL AT THE FOOT OF THE BRIDGE; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO PROCEED WITH THE ACQUISITION.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

14. Delta-Mendota Canal Angling Access, Stanislaus County \$3,500.00

Mr. Nesbit related that the Wildlife Conservation Board at its meeting of March 12, 1964, approved and allocated funds for development of angling access facilities in a 12½ mile reach of the Delta-Mendota Canal in Fresno County. This development is completed and was opened to the public on June 13, 1964. The area is receiving considerable use and the fishing has been good.

The proposed project in Stanislaus County is similar to the Fresno County project in that it provides for WCB development of sanitary facilities and signs. The area is two miles in length and is on a lined portion of the Canal. It is now open to public use and has been leased to the County by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. The County has provided parking areas and the Bureau has installed safety devices and steps down to the canal bank.

Mr. Nesbit reported that he has been a member of the Delta-Mendota Canal Access Committee, along with representatives of the Department of Fish and Game and Bureau of Reclamation. The Committee report "A Plan for Opening Parts of the Delta-Mendota Canal for Public Angling" recommended opening of five areas comprising 50 miles of the 119 mile long canal. The Stanislaus County two mile portion was one of the two areas given top priority for opening, the other being the Fresno County portion now opened.

The Department of Fish and Game's favorable fishery recommendation states that large populations of catfish and striped bass exist in the canal as demonstrated by rescue operations when the canal had been drained for maintenance purposes.

The Stanislaus County Board of Supervisors has agreed by resolution to maintenance of the development.

Cost estimates prepared by the Department's engineering section and staff are as follows:

Sanitary facilities - 10 @ \$212 ea. plus freight & tax	\$2,500
Trash receptacles - 10 @ \$10 each	100
Signs - 48 redwood directional and location	600
Contingencies	300
TOTAL	<u>\$3,500</u>



Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
July 17, 1964

Mr. Nesbit recommended that the project be approved, that \$3,500 be allocated for development, and that the Department and staff be authorized to proceed with the project.

Assemblywoman Davis asked if the staff has secured an attorney general's opinion relative to the State's liability in fishing access projects of the WCB. Mr. Nesbit replied that it has been secured and that a statement has been prepared.

Liability - Attorney General's Opinion

At the March 12 meeting the Board requested that staff obtain an Attorney General's opinion relative to the State's liability and extent of liability attached to fishing access projects of the Board.

We have obtained this opinion. In essence it states that the Board would be jointly and severally liable upon any liability which may arise but that the public entities may allocate, as part of their agreement, the financial responsibility among themselves in whatever manner seems most desirable to them.

The allocation of responsibility referred to in the Attorney General's opinion is covered by inclusion of an indemnification clause in all agreements for operation and maintenance of WCB access projects. The indemnification clause which would be included in the agreement for operation and maintenance of the Delta-Mendota Canal project would read as follows:

"The County agrees to indemnify and save harmless the State, its officers, agents, and employees from any and all claims and losses occurring or resulting to any person, firm or corporation who may be injured or damaged by the County in the performance of this agreement, and with respect to Section 895.4, Government Code of California, the County shall and will indemnify the State as hereinabove provided."

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR QUICK, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN DANNEMEYER, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE DELTA-MENDOTA CANAL ANGLING ACCESS, STANISLAUS COUNTY; ALLOCATE FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND \$3,500 FOR ITS DEVELOPMENT; 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. HALPIN, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE DELTA-MENDOTA CANAL ANGLING ACCESS, STANISLAUS COUNTY; ALLOCATE FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND \$3,500 FOR ITS DEVELOPMENT; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
July 17, 1964

15. Proposed Abalone Hatchery

Senator Sturgeon asked for a discussion relative to a staff study of a proposed abalone hatchery in the vicinity of Morro Bay, San Luis Obispo County. In the discussion Mr. Shannon stated that there is a possibility of increasing the abalone resource and felt there was a real potential in this program. A staff study was felt to be in order by all.

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR STURGEON, SECONDED BY MR. SHANNON, AS A JOINT MOTION, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD DIRECT THE STAFF OF THE BOARD TO MAKE A FEASIBILITY STUDY OF A PROGRAM FOR THE ARTIFICIAL PROPAGATION OF ABALONE IN THE VICINITY OF MORRO BAY, SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

16. Next WCB Meeting

Mr. Clineschmidt extended an invitation to the Board to hold its next meeting in the northern part of the state and suggested the City of Redding. It was Assemblywoman Davis' hope that the exact date would not come shortly after the general election, because of the many commitments the legislators would have at that time. Mr. Clineschmidt requested the staff to canvass the Board members later for a suitable date for a meeting in Redding.

17. Proposed Hatchery at Sucker Springs, Shasta County

Mr. Clineschmidt recommended that the staff be instructed to investigate the feasibility of locating a hatchery at Sucker Springs in Shasta County. A name change was suggested by Mr. Clineschmidt if such a study proved the facility would be suitable. Mr. Shannon agreed that the site has a great potential and suggested that the staff look into the engineering estimate of a test plant and report back at the next meeting.

18. Parks and Recreational Bond Act Program

Mr. Nesbit presented for discussion the role of the WCB under the State Beach, Park, Recreational, and Historical Facilities Bond Act of 1964 (Proposition No. 1 on the November ballot). This act provides for five million dollars as a supplement to the WCB program; this will be for projects not possible under the present limited program now being carried out.

In planning a Bond Act program, Mr. Nesbit stated, we have been guided by the Board's present policies, its criteria and its desire to continue to serve all parts of the state and all segments of the public.

We have looked to those programs which are statewide in scope, which can be presented to the legislature in a package and which will benefit many people. We are presently studying three major programs. In two of these we are responding to resolutions passed by the Senate at the 1964 Budget Session. The first is Senate Resolution No. 110 which reads as follows:

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
July 17, 1964

WHEREAS, The number of fishermen in California is increasing continuously at a rapid rate; and

WHEREAS, This places great pressure on the State's lakes and streams; and

WHEREAS, The Department of Fish and Game has limited funds, which permits little increase in hatchery operating budgets, and prevents any significant increase in fish production with present facilities; and

WHEREAS, It appears that modernization and automation of the State's hatchery system could increase fish production substantially within the existing budget; and

WHEREAS, Proposition No. 1 at the November 1964 General Election provides \$5,000,000 to the Wildlife Conservation Board for capital outlay projects relating to hunting and fishing; and

WHEREAS, Failure to initiate studies prior to the passage of Proposition No. 1 will delay approval of hatchery modernization; and

WHEREAS, The current budget for the Department of Fish and Game and Wildlife Conservation Board is sufficient to pay for this study without further augmentation; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the Wildlife Conservation Board and the Department of Fish and Game are directed to study the feasibility of increasing fish production without increasing operating costs beyond the department's funding capacity by modernization, consolidation, automation and replacement of existing facilities, and to study the feasibility of establishing a warm-water fish hatchery; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Chairman of the Wildlife Conservation Board, the Director of the Department of Fish and Game, and the Administrator of the Resources Agency.

Adopted May 7, 1964.

The second is Senate Resolution No. 122 as follows:

WHEREAS, Recreational demands including the needs for fishing and hunting areas are increasing with California population growth; and

WHEREAS, Public lands important for wildlife and recreation purposes are being sold into private ownership at an increasing rate; and

WHEREAS, Industrial and urban developments are reducing lands available to the public for hunting, fishing and other recreational purposes; and

WHEREAS, The State Beach, Park, Recreational, and Historical Facilities Bond Act of 1964 will be submitted to the voters for approval at the November general election; and

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
July 17, 1964

WHEREAS, Such act includes an allocation of \$5,000,000 to the program of the Wildlife Conservation Board; and

WHEREAS, The Wildlife Conservation Board has a program of providing wildlife habitat and public access to hunting and fishing throughout the State of California; and

WHEREAS, The State Lands Commission in 1963 adopted a policy which gave state agencies up to two years to acquire certain state-owned lands before the commission makes such lands available for sale into private ownership; and

WHEREAS, Various parcels of such lands under jurisdiction of the State Lands Commission have such importance for wildlife habitat and associated recreation that full consideration should be given to acquisition by the Wildlife Conservation Board; and

WHEREAS, California's expanding population will benefit in the years to come from action taken to acquire and reserve important wildlife and recreation lands in public ownership; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the Wildlife Conservation Board be directed to make a study of lands important for wildlife habitat and associated public fishing and hunting recreation purposes and to relate this study to the requirements of acquiring or retaining such lands in public ownership through the Recreation Bond Act; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Chairman of the Wildlife Conservation Board, the Director of the Department of Fish and Game, and the Administrator of the Resources Agency

Adopted May 11, 1964

At this time, studies are not complete and cost estimates have not been made. The staff will have definite plans and estimates for the next meeting. Mr. Nesbit suggested three programs for Board consideration.

I. Modernization, Consolidation and Automation of Existing Hatchery Facilities.

This plan is being developed by the Department and evaluated by WCB staff. It preliminarily would include the following:

1. Construction of a warmwater fish hatchery for channel catfish in southern California. The Department preliminary report appears favorable. Presently a committee is evaluating sites and refining cost estimates.
2. Consolidation of outmoded hatchery facilities into a new modern hatchery east of the Sierra in Mono or Inyo counties.
3. Enlargement of the Cedar Creek Hatchery for better production for the silver salmon program.
4. Construction of a modern, automated trout hatchery probably near Sacramento which could be operated largely on savings from elimination of the planting base facilities in Region 2.



Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
July 17, 1964

All these proposals are being studied. The objective in all is to increase production without appreciably increasing operating costs. One objective is to be prepared to supply the necessary fish for the many new reservoirs being built. Another objective is to supply more fishing, both warmwater and trout, for southern California.

It has been twelve years since any major developments have been accomplished on the state's hatchery system. In this period, water development in the form of reservoir has perhaps doubled and many more are presently being constructed or planned.

Assemblywoman Davis stated she realized the modernization of facilities will lessen the cost per trout, but cited the policy of the Department and the Commission that trout production costs would not exceed the revenue brought in by the sale of trout stamps.

Mr. Shannon felt that this needs to be examined and costs arrived at. The overall costs may go up, although he noted that license increase this year was the largest the Department has ever had, and there might be enough latitude to carry out this program. The Department is faced with the problem of providing fish for all the new reservoirs constructed or under construction. An approval of this program will not commit the Board to any of these proposals.

II. Purchase of Key Lands for Access and Fish and Game Habitat

This program would relate largely to the excess State Lands Commission lands but could also include other key parcels of land made available by federal agencies or private individuals.

We do not propose the purchase of vast acreages, nor do we propose any land for condemnation, Mr. Nesbit stated. In effect this proposal would be an acceleration of the present purchase of key lands under the hunting and fishing access program, but would request authorization at one time for a number of such projects. When developments are needed they would be submitted individually as WCB projects at a later date under the regular funding.

On June 5, 1963, the Attorney General wrote an opinion which determined that state school lands under the jurisdiction of the State Lands Commission must be sold to benefit the support of California schools. Subsequent to this decision the State Lands Commission adopted a policy which would permit other state agencies to buy the lands of their choice before these lands were made available for public sale. Many of these parcels would indeed shut off presently enjoyed public access if sold privately. Many are key parcels adjacent to public lands. While fishing access on state school lands is assured under the California Constitution, no such provision exists for hunting access. Also, many of these lands may be needed for developing roads and parking and must be purchased before such improvements can be made.

A careful survey of these parcels is under way to determine priority in acquiring these key lands. It is not complete, but without question this could be a major WCB project of permanent value to the sportsmen throughout the state.



III. Artificial Reefs at Piers.

The Board has approved 10 reef projects. All but one have been open ocean reefs to enhance fishing for the boat fishermen. One reef was placed around the WCB-City of Imperial Beach Pier, San Diego County. Reports coming from the pier fishermen have been most encouraging. It appears fishing has been improved and at least one species never before caught in the area is now found in the pier fishermen's creel. We are presently engaged in a survey to determine the number of fishing piers in ocean waters, as well as other pertinent facts relative to their ownership, operation, and structural condition. When this information is obtained the Department biologist-divers will provide us further information on bottom conditions. Although it is too early to make an accurate appraisal, it appears that there may be between 10 to 15 piers which could have fishing improved by the placement of artificial reefs. With the several million fishermen using these piers it would indeed provide a greatly improved catch if only a 10 to 20% increase could be accomplished. We believe this to be a conservative objective.

Mr. Nesbit summarized that these are the three major programs we see as possibilities under the Bond Act. The other categories of the present program would be carried out with the annual pari-mutuel allocation. If any or all of the three programs outlined above were to be undertaken without additional funding it would require the elimination of other important programs now only partially completed.

If instructions are given to proceed, the staff will present the program in more detail at the next meeting. At that time, specific projects under this program and more detailed cost estimates will be presented. Mr. Nesbit pointed out that the Board program under its present financing should proceed in the normal manner.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, SECONDED BY SENATOR STURGEON, AS A JOINT MOTION, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE PROPOSED WCB PROGRAM UNDER THE BOND ACT, AND THE STAFF IS HEREBY DIRECTED TO PROCEED WITH ANY STUDIES NECESSARY, AND TO PRESENT SPECIFIC PROJECT PROPOSALS FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION AT THE NEXT MEETING. IT IS THE DESIRE OF THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD TO GO ON RECORD AS FAVORING PROPOSITION NO. 1, AND THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO ISSUE SUCH A STATEMENT IN ITS BEHALF.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

19. Steamboat Slough Access

Cooperative project with the Reclamation Board and Corps of Engineers

Mr. Nesbit advised that the 1962 Flood Control Act broadened the Corps' authority for recreational projects. Recently in the mid-West they have put in recreational facilities in connection with bank protection. A trial project for California was proposed by the Reclamation Board in conjunction with the Corps of Engineers on the Sacramento River project, and our staff was asked to work with them in securing county or local agency cooperation for

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
July 17, 1964

operation and maintenance. No funds for acquisition or basic development of facilities would be required from the WCB; these would be supplied by the Federal government (2/3) and the Reclamation Board (1/3). Because of our experience in contacts with many counties with respect to maintenance of access projects, the Board staff has been asked to act as intermediary in working out agreements with local agencies for operation and maintenance.

Assemblywoman Davis stated that the Corps of Engineers should not be relieved of O&M responsibilities, as she did not believe it should be passed on to the county taxpayers, who in essence have paid once already for construction of the facilities.

Mr. Hart, the Assistant Executive Officer, explained how these projects would work. These recreational facilities would be provided in conjunction with the bank protection program which extends from Rio Vista to Chico Landing. The Corps of Engineers will develop the area, the Reclamation Board will acquire the site, but would want a state agency to accept or arrange with local government for operation and maintenance of the access facilities.

Mr. Shannon advised that there is some urgency on this and that the Reclamation Board must know soon whether or not O&M would be taken care of. He suggested that the staff take this on and then report back to the Board as to what problems, if any, are involved, and the Board can then develop a long-range policy. Unless this is done the Corps of Engineers will not make provisions for recreational development on this particular bank protection contract.

Assemblywoman Davis asked if this bank protection project of the Corps would go as far as Red Bluff. She stated that the Red Bluff people are making inquiries to their legislators as to who is going to assume maintenance costs for recreational facilities, as they do not wish to handle it.

Mr. Shannon felt that if the staff were asked to work on this, they might find that the county is not willing to undertake the maintenance costs, but that it should be explored.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. HALPIN, AS A JOINT MOTION, THAT THE STAFF IS DIRECTED TO WORK WITH THE RECLAMATION BOARD AND THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS TO PROVIDE RECREATIONAL FACILITIES ON STEAMBOAT SLOUGH IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT. AUTHORIZATION FOR WCB PARTICIPATION IS HEREBY GIVEN FOR THIS PROJECT ONLY, AND IT IS UNDERSTOOD THAT WCB PARTICIPATION THEREIN DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A PRECEDENCE.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Gene Conway's request to discuss the Colorado River projects of the Bureau of Reclamation was tabled due to his absence.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

## Status of Funds

The amount allocated to projects as of the close of the meeting on July 17, 1964, aggregated \$19,108,184.00\*.

a. Fish Hatchery and Stocking Projects . . . . .	\$4,434,499.31
b. Fish Habitat Development and Improvement Projects . . . . .	2,593,932.73
1. Reservoir Construction or Improvement . . . . .	\$1,434,608.19
2. Stream Clearance and Improvement . . . . .	192,170.98
3. Stream Flow Maintenance Dams . . . . .	439,503.32
4. Marine Habitat . . . . .	86,697.09
5. Fish Screens, Ladders, & Weir Projects . . . . .	440,953.15
c. Angling Access Projects . . . . .	4,894,336.34
1. Coastal Access . . . . .	654,240.86
2. River, Stream and Bay Access . . . . .	1,158,189.28
3. Lake, Reservoir and Salton Sea Access . . . . .	1,755,945.94
4. Piers . . . . .	1,710,355.26
d. Game Farm Projects . . . . .	146,894.49
e. Game Habitat Development and Improvement Projects . . . . .	6,024,135.34
1. Waterfowl Areas . . . . .	5,515,604.50
2. Other Game . . . . .	452,530.84
3. Wildlife Management Areas . . . . .	56,000.00
f. Hunting Access . . . . .	358,193.71
g. Miscellaneous Projects . . . . .	238,297.08
Total Allocated to Specific Projects . . . . .	\$19,074,684.00
Special Project Allocations . . . . .	33,500.00
Proj. Evaluation, Prop. Acq. & Eng'ing Studies . . . . .	25,000.00
Program Report . . . . .	8,500.00
Total Allocated . . . . .	\$19,108,184.00

\*WCB allocated \$668,190.00 under Public Works Acceleration Program-  
50% reimbursable to State from the Federal Government. (\$334,095.00)  
(Two projects have been completed and closed leaving \$612,790 allocated;  
\$306,395 reimbursable as expended.)

Operating Costs:	
FY 47/48 thru 62/63 Actual . . . . .	\$830,842.55
FY 63/64 Estimated . . . . .	87,143.00
FY 64/65 Estimated . . . . .	85,467.00
Total Actual and Estimated Operating Costs . . . . .	1,003,452.55

### Recapitulation:

Allocations for Projects . . . . .	\$19,074,684.00
Special Project Allocations . . . . .	33,500.00
Expenses of Operation . . . . .	1,003,452.55
Total Expended or Obligated . . . . .	\$20,111,636.55

Total Funds Appropriated . . . . .	\$18,750,000.00
Approp. made available 7/1/64 . . . . .	750,000.00
Int. on Surplus Money Inv. thru 6/30/64 . . . . .	734,232.77
Miscellaneous Revenue thru 63/64 . . . . .	132,201.36
Total Sum Available . . . . .	\$20,366,434.13
Total Expended or Obligated . . . . .	20,111,636.55
Available thru June 30, 1965 . . . . .	\$254,797.58