

State of California  
The Resources Agency  
Department of Fish and Game  
WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD

Minutes, Meeting of February 26, 1974

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>C O N T E N T S</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
1.	Roll Call . . . . .	1
2.	Election of Chairman . . . . .	2
3.	Approval of Minutes . . . . .	2
4.	Status of Funds . . . . .	2
5.	Recovery of Funds . . . . .	2 - 5
6.	Status of Land and Water Conservation Fund . . . . .	5 - 6
7.	California Environmental Quality Act Procedures . . . . .	6 - 7
8.	Fields Landing Fishing Access Improvements . . . . .	7 - 9
9.	So. Fork Eel River Fishing Access (Parcels 2 & 3) Humboldt County . . . . .	9 - 10
10.	Feather River Fishing Access, Plumas County . . . . .	10 - 11
11.	Upper Tomales Bay, Marin County . . . . .	11 - 13
12.	Channel Islands Harbor Coastal Access, Ventura Co. . . . .	14 - 15
13.	Reef Program . . . . .	15 - 18
14.	Whittier-Narrows Fishing Lakes Expansion, L.A. County . . . . .	18 - 20
15.	Heeser Drive Fishing Access, Mendocino County . . . . .	21 - 24
16.	Central Valleys Pilot Striped Bass Hatchery, Sacra- mento County . . . . .	24 - 26
17.	Putah Creek Fishing Access Expansion, Yolo County . . . . .	26 - 27
18.	Martinez Fishing Pier - Augmentation, Contra Costa Co. . . . .	28 - 29
19.	Rio Vista North Fishing Access, Solano County . . . . .	30
20.	Domestic Water Treatment Units . . . . .	31 - 32
21.	1974 Parks and Recreation Bond Act Program . . . . .	32 - 36
22.	Yuba River Fishing Access, Yuba County . . . . .	36 - 37
	Program Statement . . . . .	38

State of California  
The Resources Agency  
Department of Fish and Game  
WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD

Minutes, Meeting of February 26, 1974

Pursuant to the call of the Acting Chairman, the Wildlife Conservation Board met in Room 6024 of the State Capitol Building, Sacramento, California, on February 26, 1974. The meeting was called to order by Acting Chairman Peter Fletcher at 1:40 p.m.

1. Roll Call

PRESENT: Peter T. Fletcher Acting Chairman  
G. Ray Arnett Member  
Edward M. Fryer Member, vice Mr. Verne Orr

Senator Fred W. Marler Joint Interim Committee

Assemblywoman Pauline L. Davis  
Assemblyman Walter W. Powers

Chester M. Hart Executive Officer  
Alvin G. Rutsch Assistant Executive Officer  
John Wentzel Field Agent  
Jim Sarro Land Agent  
Alma Koyasako Secretary  
Bella Applebaum Accountant

ABSENT: Senator Robert J. Lagomarsino Joint Interim Committee  
Senator Lawrence E. Walsh  
Assemblyman Barry Keene

OTHERS PRESENT:

Joe Sheehan Dept. of Fish and Game  
Les McCargo Dept. of Parks and Recreation  
A. J. McGuckin  
William Schafer Dept. of Fish and Game  
Milan Pohl Student Intern  
Thomas V. Henley Humboldt Co. Public Works  
William C. Peters Humboldt Co. Public Works - Parks  
Arthur P. Kramer Mendocino Co. Dept. of Parks  
and Beaches  
Mary Chessher Wildlife Conservation Board  
Hubert L. Duke L.A. Co. Dept. of Parks & Rec.  
Henry Van Dyke, Jr. City of Martinez  
Mickey Bailey Office of Assemblyman Keene  
Earl Balch Yolo County  
John Middlebrook Yuba County

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
February 26, 1974

2. Election of Chairman

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ARNETT, SECONDED BY MR. FRYER, AS A JOINT MOTION, THAT MR. PETER T. FLETCHER BE ELECTED CHAIRMAN OF THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Approval of Minutes

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ARNETT, SECONDED BY SENATOR MARLER, AS A JOINT MOTION, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 1, 1973, MEETING.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Status of Funds

Mr. Chester M. Hart, the Executive Officer, gave the following report on the Wildlife Restoration Fund status as of the date of this meeting.

Unallocated balance after 5/1/73 Meeting . . . . .	\$187,581.88
Interest on surplus money -- Jan.-Dec., 1973 . . . . .	+184,885.70
Unexpended balance 70/71 support . . . . .	+11,874.03
Miscellaneous revenue . . . . .	+1,323.00
Appropriation made available July 1, 1973 . . . . .	+750,000.00
Less Prior Allocation (Gray Lodge Wildlife Area) . . . . .	-615,000.00
Less Estimated 1973/74 Operating Costs . . . . .	-168,649.00
Unallocated Balance, February 26, 1974 . . . . .	\$352,015.61

5. Recovery of Funds

Mr. Hart reported that the following 16 projects have balances of funds that can be recovered and returned to the Wildlife Restoration Fund. The first 10 projects have been completed and these project accounts can be closed.

Lake Edson Access

Allocation	\$45,000.00
Expenditures	\$44,636.41
Fed. L&W Reimbursement	-21,822.30
WCB Expenditures	-22,814.11
Balance for Recovery	\$22,185.89

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
February 26, 1974

Balls Ferry Access

Allocation		\$37,000.00
Expenditures	\$37,000.00	
Fed. L&W Reimbursement	<u>-18,088.60</u>	
WCB Expenditures		<u>-18,911.40</u>
Balance for Recovery		\$18,088.60

South Fork Eel River Stream Clearance

Allocation		\$22,000.00
Expenditures		<u>-21,998.38</u>
Balance for Recovery		\$ 1.62

Imperial Warmwater Test Hatchery

Allocation		\$157,482.00
Expenditures		<u>- 152,181.88</u>
Balance for Recovery		\$ 5,300.12

Banta Carbona Fish Screen

Allocation		\$190,000.00
Expenditures	\$190,000.00	
Fed. Anadromous Fish Reimb.	<u>- 95,000.00</u>	
WCB Expenditures		<u>-95,000.00</u>
Previously recovered		<u>-94,000.00</u>
Balance for Recovery		\$1,000.00

Sonoma Coastal Stream Clearance

Allocation		\$14,000.00
Expenditures		<u>-13,131.59</u>
Balance for Recovery		\$ 868.41

Dredger Riffles

Allocation		\$2,350.00
Expenditures		<u>-2,140.78</u>
Balance for Recovery		\$ 209.22

Three Rocks Access

Allocation		\$13,000.00
Expenditures		<u>-10,472.25</u>
Balance for Recovery		\$ 2,527.75

Bridgeport Fishing Access

Allocation		\$75,500.00
Expenditures		<u>-73,838.26</u>
Balance for Recovery		\$ 1,661.74



Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
February 26, 1974

San Mateo Pier

Allocation	\$79,000.00
Expenditures	77,617.02
Balance for Recovery	\$ 1,382.98

Santa Cruz Pier

Fed. L&W Reimbursement Recovery	\$46,246.43
(Account to remain open)	

Putah Creek Access

Fed. L&W Reimbursement Recovery	\$29,333.00
(Account to remain open)	

Pacifica Fishing Pier

Fed. L&W Reimbursement Recovery	\$189,960.32
(Account to remain open)	

San Pablo Reservoir Access

Fed. L&W Reimbursement Recovery	\$85,286.85
(Account to remain open)	

Berkeley Fishing Pier

Fed. L&W Reimbursement Recovery	\$ 17,579.00
(Account to remain open)	

Upper Klamath River Access

Fed. L&W Reimbursement Recovery	\$36,709.00
(Account to remain open)	

TOTAL RECOVERY \$458,340.93

Mr. Hart recommended that the total amount of \$458,340.93 as shown in the above 16 project accounts be recovered and returned to the Wildlife Restoration Fund. It was further recommended that the accounts of all of the above projects, except as noted, be closed.

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR MARLER, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN POWERS, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD RECOVER THE UNEXPENDED BALANCES AS REQUESTED AND CLOSE THE ACCOUNTS AS INDICATED. ALL OF THE SUMS TOTALING \$458,340.93 CAN BE RECOVERED AND RETURNED TO THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
February 26, 1974

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ARNETT, SECONDED BY MR. FRYER, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD RECOVER FUNDS FROM THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS AND CLOSE THE PROJECT ACCOUNTS EXCEPT AS INDICATED.

Lake Edson Access	\$22,185.89
Balls Ferry Access	18,088.60
South Fork Eel River Stream Clearance	1.62
Imperial Warmwater Test Hatchery	5,300.12
Banta Carbona Fish Screen	1,000.00
Sonoma Coastal Stream Clearance	868.41
Dredger Riffles	209.22
Three Rocks Access	2,527.75
Bridgeport Fishing Access	1,661.74
San Mateo Pier	1,382.98
Santa Cruz Pier (Account to remain open)	46,246.43
Putah Creek Access (Account to remain open)	29,333.00
Pacifica Fishing Pier (Account to remain open)	189,960.32
San Pablo Reserv. Access (Acct. to remain open)	85,286.85
Berkeley Fishing Pier (Account to remain open)	17,579.00
Upper Klamath River Access (Acct. to remain open)	36,709.00

ALL OF THE SUMS TOTALING \$458,340.93 ARE TO BE RECOVERED AND RETURNED TO THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Hart informed the Board that with these recoveries, there is now a total of \$810,356.54 in the Wildlife Restoration Fund available for allocation to projects.

6. Status of Land and Water Conservation Fund

The Executive Officer advised that the Wildlife Conservation Board has participated in the Land and Water Conservation Fund program since its inception in 1965. Federal reimbursements to date under this program have enabled the WCB to allocate an additional \$3.75 million for project development.

There was a severe reduction in Land and Water Conservation Fund monies in the federal budget for 1973-74, to \$66 million nationwide as compared to \$181 million for the previous year. California's apportionment, which had varied between \$12.0 and \$17.8 million in the three previous years dropped to \$2.6 million.

Reasons given by the federal Bureau of Outdoor Recreation for the cut were that a sizable balance of unobligated and unexpended money existed from previous apportionments. Apparently little consideration was given to State commitments of funds for projects as opposed to a technical definition of "unobligated", and to the penalty effects on States that were essentially current in their utilization of, and needs for, these funds.

The Wildlife Conservation Board share of California's reduced apportionment this year was \$397,914, as compared to \$1,687,971 last year. Additional monies may be available from reserve funds at both the regional and national levels of BOR but on a special project basis in competition with other state and local governmental projects.

Due to the L&WCF monies actually being received on a reimbursement basis, after projects are completed or expenditures made, the effects of this reduced apportionment will not be felt immediately. However, it will result in less money being returned to the Wildlife Restoration Fund for use on WCB projects in fiscal year 74-75 and possibly 75-76.

Reportedly, consideration is being given to restoring funding for the L&WCF program to previous or higher levels in the 1974-75 federal budget.

Senator Marler noted that previously California's apportionment was 7 to 10% of the total Land and Water Conservation Fund moneys. This year, even with \$66,000,000, it has dropped to \$2.6 million which is perhaps 4% of the total appropriation and asked the reason for this cutback.

Mr. Les McCargo, Department of Parks and Recreation, responded that he did not know why there has been this reduction in the California allocation. However, in discussions with Mr. Frank Sylvester, Regional Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, it was brought out that funds potentially available to State agencies in California was up to the 7% level based upon the use of a contingency fund which was held back this fiscal year.

#### 7. California Environmental Quality Act Procedures

Mr. Hart advised that this is an informational item relative to the procedures necessitated under the California Environmental Quality Act. Many WCB projects are subject to the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 and to the State Guidelines and Department of Fish and Game regulations adopted pursuant to this Act. The objective is to build into the decision-making process an appropriate and careful consideration of all environmental aspects of proposed projects. Copies of the Act, guidelines and regulations provided to Board members indicated the procedures are quite detailed and complex.

Staff will review this material as it is revised from time to time in order to maintain or recommend appropriate procedures for WCB projects, including specific actions by the Board, which will meet the intent and requirements of the CEQA, guidelines and regulations.

The actual procedures, processing steps, and responsibilities for meeting CEQA requirements will vary with project circumstances. For WCB projects these variables primarily will include (1) whether WCB is the lead agency or a responsible agency; (2) whether or not the project falls under CEQA requirements; and (3), if under CEQA requirements, whether the proposal qualifies for a categorical exemption or requires a negative declaration or EIR.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
February 26, 1974

Staff will process appropriate documents or will cooperate with the lead agency on such matters. Where WCB is the lead agency, such processing will be in accordance with regulations adopted for the Department of Fish and Game and WCB in Title 14 of the California Administrative Code. The authority of the Director, Department of Fish and Game, for such processing pursuant to these regulations has been delegated to the Executive Officer, WCB, for WCB projects. This will simplify administrative procedures and minimize the required time and workload.

Processing negative declarations or EIR's when required does add substantially to the workload and time required to prepare proposed projects for formal consideration at WCB meetings.

In summary, as a decision-making body for project implementation, the Board is required to consider an Environmental Impact Report or negative declaration when such documents are necessary under project circumstances, before acting upon or approving the project. Copies of the project EIR or negative declaration will be provided to Board members for review with other agenda material prior to meetings.

For projects that do not require an EIR or negative declaration, agenda material will include information on how CEQA requirements have been met.

Mr. Hart summarized that in effect there are various actions necessary by the Board in approving a project, depending on whether the Board is the lead agency or a responsible agency. Mr. Fletcher concluded that the motion of the Board approving a project should then include information that the necessary CEQA requirements have been met, and Mr. Hart agreed that this should be included.

8. Fields Landing Fishing Access Improvements, Humboldt County \$75,000.00

Mr. Hart reported that this coastal fishing access facility was initially constructed by the Board in 1961 at a cost of \$27,250. Humboldt County has proposed that improvements be made to this project which is the only public boat access to south Humboldt Bay and is operated and maintained by the County. It is located in the small community of Fields Landing, just south of Eureka city limits.

Project facilities consist of a small parking area and concrete launching ramp limited to a narrow strip of county-owned road right-of-way terminating on the bay.

Public use of this small access site has steadily increased since it was first opened thirteen years ago. To eliminate congestion, parking area improvements are needed and the ramp should be extended into deeper water to facilitate launching of boats at low tide. Floats at the ramp and sanitary facilities are also needed.



Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
February 26, 1974

Such upgrading of facilities would be in keeping with Board practice to provide improvements to early WCB projects where initial development was minimal but substantial public use has developed.

The County of Humboldt is proceeding with the acquisition of the adjoining property needed for the parking lot improvements. The county has, by resolution, indicated a willingness to lease this additional area of approximately one acre to the State for a 25 year term, and to maintain the improvements for a similar period. Existing lease and operating agreements with the county will be amended to fulfill this requirement. Construction contract administration would be handled by the county by a standard agreement with the State.

The construction cost breakdown as prepared by the County Department of Public Works is as follows:

Site preparation . . . . .	\$1,000
Excavation . . . . .	4,800
Concrete . . . . .	2,300
Place footings, anchors & slabs . . . . .	4,000
Floats . . . . .	9,200
Base and paving . . . . .	32,000
Fencing, striping, wheel stops, signs . . . . .	4,300
Restroom, masonry structure w/chemical units . . . . .	5,000
Subtotal . . . . .	\$62,600
Contingencies, 20% . . . . .	12,400
TOTAL ESTIMATED COST . . . . .	\$75,000

The reconstructed project as proposed will have substantially the same purpose and capacity, and will cause no significant environmental impact. It has been determined by the staff that this proposal is in a categorically exempt class in accordance with State guidelines for implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act.

Mr. Hart recommended that the Board approve the proposed improvements to the Fields Landing Coastal Fishing Access project, allocate \$75,000 therefor, and authorize the staff to proceed substantially as planned. It was his further recommendation that staff be authorized to apply for Land and Water Conservation Funds for reimbursement of one-half of the project costs.

Mr. Fletcher acknowledged the presence of Mr. William Peters, Assistant Director of the Humboldt County Department of Public Works, who could respond to any questions the members might have. There being none,

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR MARLER, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN POWERS, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS TO THE FIELDS

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
February 26, 1974

LANDING FISHING ACCESS PROJECT; ALLOCATE \$75,000 THEREFOR;  
AND AUTHORIZE STAFF TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY  
AS PLANNED. THE STAFF IS FURTHER AUTHORIZED TO MAKE APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUNDS.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ARNETT, SECONDED BY MR. FRYER, THAT THE  
WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS  
TO THE FIELDS LANDING FISHING ACCESS PROJECT; ALLOCATE \$75,000  
THEREFOR; AND AUTHORIZE STAFF TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT  
SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED. THE STAFF IS FURTHER AUTHORIZED TO  
MAKE APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUNDS.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Fletcher introduced Assemblywoman Pauline Davis who had just arrived at the meeting.

9. South Fork Eel River Fishing Access (Parcels 2 and 3), Humboldt Co. \$11,000.00

The Executive Officer reported that at the May 1, 1973, meeting, the WCB allocated funds to acquire a 7.35 acre parcel of land along the South Fork of the Eel River. This parcel has almost 1,800 feet of frontage on the river and has now been transferred from the Department of Transportation to WCB.

Two additional parcels of excess Department of Transportation land along the South Fork Eel are now available. These parcels are located north of Garberville, in the same area as the recently acquired land. They total 27.94 acres and have over 4,000 feet of frontage on the river. The land is appraised at \$10,575.00.

The Department of Fish and Game recommends acquisition of this land, pointing out that access to this fine steelhead-salmon stream is quite limited and that existing access areas such as this should be retained in public ownership. Further, the Department's management program for this stream should improve the runs of fish in future years.

No development is planned or needed at this time. Humboldt County has expressed interest in maintaining the land if it is acquired by WCB.

Since no development is planned and use of the area will remain substantially the same, acquisition will have no significant environmental impact and CEQA requirements do not apply.

Mr. Hart recommended that the Board approve this project, allocate \$11,000 for acquisition and related costs, and authorize staff to proceed with the project substantially as planned.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
February 26, 1974

The Executive Officer advised that Mr. Paul McKeehan, on behalf of the California Wildlife Federation, the Associated Sportsmen of California, and Salmon Unlimited, had written a letter vigorously supporting this acquisition.

In response to Senator Marler's question regarding the fishery, Mr. William Peters of Humboldt County advised that this area is one of the most heavily used areas of the Eel River for salmon and steelhead fishing during the fall run. During the summer there is a trout fishery. He wanted to point out that Humboldt County has informally indicated they would maintain the area as a fishing access if the State acquired the property. At the Humboldt County Parks and Recreation Commission meeting on February 14, this acquisition was endorsed and a recommendation was made to the Humboldt County Board of Supervisors to undertake this maintenance, provided that the WCB does not construct structures, such as elaborate restroom facilities. Maintenance of the area would be limited to litter pickup and policing; the County would like to take another look at this responsibility if it included such other maintenance which might be necessitated by construction of restroom facilities, etc.

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR MARLER, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYWOMAN DAVIS, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE SOUTH FORK EEL RIVER FISHING ACCESS (PARCELS 2 AND 3), HUMBOLDT COUNTY; ALLOCATE \$11,000.00 TO COVER ACQUISITION AND RELATED COSTS; AND AUTHORIZE STAFF TO PROCEED SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED, WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT HUMBOLDT COUNTY WILL PROVIDE LITTER PICK-UP AND POLICING OF THE AREA.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ARNETT, SECONDED BY MR. FRYER, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE SOUTH FORK EEL RIVER FISHING ACCESS (PARCELS 2 AND 3), HUMBOLDT COUNTY; ALLOCATE \$11,000.00 TO COVER ACQUISITION AND RELATED COSTS; AND AUTHORIZE STAFF TO PROCEED SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED, WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT HUMBOLDT COUNTY WILL PROVIDE LITTER PICK-UP AND POLICING OF THE AREA.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

10. Feather River Fishing Access, Plumas County \$800.00

Mr. Hart reported that three parcels of Division of Highways land, totaling about 13 acres, have been declared surplus. The land lies along the Middle Fork Feather River, in the Portola area.

The Department of Fish and Game has recommended acquisition of the property by the Wildlife Conservation Board, pointing out that retention in public ownership would continue to provide fishing access and preservation of wildlife habitat. The land is also utilized by local youth clubs for field classes in general conservation principles.



Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
February 26, 1974

There would be no development planned or needed and any necessary maintenance would be handled by the Department with a minimum of effort.

There has been a staff determination that acquisition of these lands will not have a significant effect on the environment and therefore is not subject to requirements of CEQA. WCB purchase will continue public ownership and existing uses.

The property has been appraised at \$560. It was Mr. Hart's recommendation that the Board approve this project, allocate \$800.00 for acquisition and related costs, and authorize staff and the Department of Fish and Game to proceed with the project substantially as planned. Mr. Hart mentioned that Mr. Paul McKeehan had written in support of this project.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYWOMAN DAVIS, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN POWERS, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE FEATHER RIVER FISHING ACCESS, PLUMAS COUNTY; ALLOCATE \$800.00 TO COVER ACQUISITION AND RELATED COSTS; AND AUTHORIZE STAFF TO PROCEED SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ARNETT, SECONDED BY MR. FRYER, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE FEATHER RIVER FISHING ACCESS, PLUMAS COUNTY; ALLOCATE \$800.00 TO COVER ACQUISITION AND RELATED COSTS; AND AUTHORIZE STAFF TO PROCEED SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

11. Upper Tomales Bay, Marin County Bagley Conservation Funds

Last year the Board approved and completed the acquisition of some 517 acres of land in three parcels at the upper end of Tomales Bay in Marin County. The area is valued highly by the Department and by private conservation organizations for its combination of tidal flats, salt and freshwater marshes, and riparian habitat that support a wide variety of fish and wildlife, and for its fishing and other recreational use opportunities.

Included in this acquisition was a tidal flat and marsh area of 482 acres and a nearby strip of shoreline on the east side of the bay containing 21 acres. The Board now has an opportunity to purchase an additional 14-acre strip of shoreline which would connect these two parcels to provide protection to a continuous strip of bay shore  $1\frac{1}{2}$  miles in length. In addition to the shoreline protection and continuity of State ownership that would be afforded, the parcel contains wildlife habitat and fishing access values comparable to the previously acquired properties.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
February 26, 1974

Staff has obtained from the owners of the property an option to purchase the land for its appraised price of \$21,500. The staff has obtained an appraisal of the property by Mr. Burl Howell, M.A.I., and the appraisal has been approved by the Department of General Services. Bagley Conservation Fund monies for the purchase and related costs are available to the Board under item 350.3 of the 1973-74 Budget Act.

Adjoining the previously acquired 21 acre parcel and the optioned land is a .12 acre tidal flat and marsh in state ownership under jurisdiction of the State Lands Commission. It would be desirable to add this parcel to the WCB acquired area, which would be possible by a free, long-term permit according to communications with State Lands Commission staff.

Acquisition of these two parcels to protect and maintain existing or natural conditions would not have a significant effect on the environment.

Mr. Hart recommended the Board approve exercising the option on the private property with purchase of Bagley Conservation Fund monies and securing a permit covering the State Lands Commission property, and authorize staff to proceed with the project substantially as planned. He also mentioned that Senator Peter Behr had written of his strong support for this proposal.

The necessity for having an appraisal reviewed by the Department of General Services was questioned by Senator Marler. It was his recollection that the Board was faced with a problem when the Department of General Services did not approve an appraisal, and he did not wish this procedure to establish a policy.

Mr. Fletcher asked if the procedures would differ in this instance inasmuch as these are Bagley Conservation Funds rather than the usual Wildlife Restoration Funds. Mr. Hart and Mr. Jim Sarro, staff land agent, confirmed that land acquisition procedures are different in the case of projects funded out of the Wildlife Restoration Fund as opposed to budgeted funds such as this Bagley Conservation Fund project. Mr. Sarro added that this acquisition is governed by the Property Acquisition Law since it is a budgeted item and requires the approval of the Public Works Board. Acquisitions of the Board under its regular funding do not require Public Works Board approval, but Department of General Services approval of such transactions is necessary under certain provisions of the Government Code. It was his belief that Department of General Services approval of any appraisal report is required, but that this question, as far as he knew, had never been researched.

Senator Marler questioned the need for WCB approval of items budgeted out of Bagley Conservation Funds, and Mr. Hart responded that previous acquisitions utilizing Bagley Conservation Funds had been brought before the Board for their knowledge and approval. He explained that these funds are set up in the budget as a lump sum line item for acquisition of lands in Upper Tomales Bay, similar to the lump sum budgeting for access projects on the California Aqueduct under the Fish and Wildlife Enhancement Bond Act. Individual projects under that category have been brought before the

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
February 26, 1974

Board for their consideration and approval, and land acquisition at Upper Tomales Bay was viewed as being in the same category.

Assemblywoman Davis agreed that under those circumstances it would appear that this project should be brought before the Wildlife Conservation Board, but that she was still not sure why, since the acquisition must also be approved by the Public Works Board. She believed that there should be a definite clarification legally as to the role of the Department of General Services in land acquisition proposals of the Board under its regular funding as well as budgeted funds, and what procedures are to be followed when utilizing Bagley Conservation Funds.

It was the consensus that procedures relative to budgeted land acquisition projects, such as under the Bagley Conservation Funds be clarified, and the Chairman ordered that the staff research this question and report back to the Board.

There was discussion and concern expressed about budgeted projects being brought before the Board for approval, there being a possibility that the Board would find its individual projects budgeted as line items if the Board were not watchful. It was requested that individual projects under lump sum appropriation in the budget be presented for Board consideration in a separate section of the agenda in recognition of the fact that there are different procedures to be followed in considering these projects as compared to the usual WCB projects.

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR MARLER, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYWOMAN DAVIS, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE ACQUISITION OF THE PROPERTY UNDER OPTION AT UPPER TOMALES BAY, MARIN COUNTY, UTILIZING BAGLEY CONSERVATION FUNDS BUDGETED FOR THE 1973-74 FISCAL YEAR; AUTHORIZE STAFF TO SECURE A PERMIT COVERING THE ADJOINING STATE LANDS COMMISSION PROPERTY; AND FURTHER AUTHORIZE STAFF TO PROCEED SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. FRYER, SECONDED BY MR. ARNETT, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE ACQUISITION OF THE PROPERTY UNDER OPTION AT UPPER TOMALES BAY, MARIN COUNTY, UTILIZING BAGLEY CONSERVATION FUNDS BUDGETED FOR THE 1973-74 FISCAL YEAR; AUTHORIZE STAFF TO SECURE A PERMIT COVERING THE ADJOINING STATE LANDS COMMISSION PROPERTY; AND FURTHER AUTHORIZE STAFF TO PROCEED SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

12. Channel Islands Harbor Coastal Access, Ventura County

Mr. Hart reported that this popular coastal access facility was developed in 1964 as a cooperative project with the County of Ventura. Wildlife Conservation Board costs for initial development totaled \$58,773. The project provides free public launching with the shortest passage to sport fishing grounds at Anacapa and other Santa Barbara Channel Islands.

Increased usage caused Ventura County to request expansion of the facilities. The WCB, on November 13, 1972, allocated \$47,000 for an additional lane on the present 4-lane ramp, and to add floats and a walkway. Board approval was with the understanding that the terms of the existing State lease and operation and maintenance agreements with the county would be extended for a 25-year period.

Before proceeding with the new development, the County Department of Airports and Harbors determined that it may not be in the best interests of the County or the boating public to make a 25-year commitment to continue the access project at the present location. The County presently is proceeding with plans to develop a new and larger launching facility about 1/2 mile farther inland in the harbor. The County feels this new location has advantages for long-term harbor development purposes and for the general boating public, particularly sail boaters.

After considering the particular circumstances involved and many alternatives regarding the WCB project improvement, staff and Ventura County Airports and Harbor Department representatives have reached agreement on recommending that the approved developments be carried out within the terms of the present lease. This lease and the related O&M agreement extend to March 31, 1984, which provides a minimum 10 year amortization period for the improvements.

The improvements are justified to provide more adequate facilities for the public and it would be highly undesirable for the project to continue for ten years or more without the needed improvements.

Mr. Hart recommended that the Board reauthorize the development without a lease extension, and that staff be directed to proceed substantially as planned. He mentioned that Senator Lagomarsino had earlier requested that his support for this proposal be recorded, and introduced Mr. Ron McClellan, representing the County of Ventura, who was available to answer any questions.

In response to Senator Marler's questions about the proposed improvements at the harbor, Mr. McClellan informed the Board that his office is presently negotiating with the Department of Navigation and Ocean Development for a grant to construct a new 7-lane launching ramp with parking for 480 cars, plus a marina with parking, a restaurant, and other facilities. This will provide a total of 12 launching lanes in all at the harbor, including the 5 at the WCB project as proposed. An engineering firm, Koebig and Koebig, is making a study and will determine what would



Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
February 26, 1974

be the best use for the inner harbor area. The present WCB developments will not be abandoned, for studies have indicated a need for 22 lanes in Ventura County for the boating population. It was brought out that a design problem which created a drop-off at the end of the ramp, making launching difficult, particularly at low tides, will be corrected along with widening of the ramp.

Mr. Arnett asked why the staff does not consider it feasible to use the ramp as it is, and Mr. Hart responded that the project, without improvements, will not provide the public service that it should. Alternatives to the 10-year lease were discussed by the Board, such as a 20-year lease cancellable by County after completion of the inner harbor, or a buy-out clause after 10 or 15 years, again after the opening of the harbor facilities. Mr. Hart explained that staff had explored these alternatives with the County. The County felt it could not commit itself to more than 10 years because the parking area could not be expanded to accommodate increased use and some of the facilities have only a 10-year life remaining. Mr. Hart stated the buy-out clause had never been approved by the Board previously and it would set a bad precedent, particularly in those instances where the local agencies could realize large profits at the expense of the fishing public.

Assemblywoman Davis requested assurance that the County would not close the facility until 10 years of the remaining term were up, and Mr. McClellan assured her that the County is obligated for that length of time.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYWOMAN DAVIS, SECONDED BY SENATOR MARLER, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD REAUTHORIZE THE IMPROVEMENTS AT CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, VENTURA COUNTY, AS APPROVED AT THE NOVEMBER 13, 1972, MEETING, TO BE UNDERTAKEN WITHOUT A LEASE EXTENSION, AND STAFF IS HEREBY DIRECTED TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ARNETT, SECONDED BY MR. FRYER, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD REAUTHORIZE THE IMPROVEMENTS AT CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, VENTURA COUNTY, AS APPROVED AT THE NOVEMBER 13, 1972, MEETING, TO BE UNDERTAKEN WITHOUT A LEASE EXTENSION, AND STAFF IS HEREBY DIRECTED TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

13. Reef Program  
Change in project criteria

Mr. Hart advised that this item is a status report on the reef program and a request for a change in the project criteria.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
February 26, 1974

At the WCB meeting on March 23, 1972, construction of artificial fishing reefs was reviewed and a new reef program authorized. This program was for development of tire reefs to enhance fisheries at ocean or bay public fishing piers by giving financial aid and technical assistance to local governments or sportsmen's organizations working through local government sponsors.

This program was based on the feasibility of using old truck and auto tires for developing artificial reefs as demonstrated in California and elsewhere. Tires are suitable and long-lasting reef material, are readily available without cost, and are easily handled.

In addition to enhancing fisheries habitat, tire reef projects help to ease the problem of disposing of old tires, becoming increasingly difficult by burning or in land fills.

The Board approved the reef program, allocated \$26,000 therefor, and authorized staff to proceed substantially as follows:

- (1) Projects would be for tire reefs at bay and ocean fishing piers.
- (2) Each reef proposal would be first submitted to the Department of Fish and Game for a fisheries evaluation and recommendation.
- (3) Each project would have to be sponsored by a local public agency, if possible with a volunteer sportsmen's group to collect and prepare the tires and to make the placements.
- (4) A maximum of \$2,000 in WCB funds could be used for each reef, for rope and cable for fastening and anchoring tires, for buoys and anchors, and, where not otherwise available, for equipment rental.
- (5) Staff would select individual reef projects, make appropriate arrangements for construction and provide a report to the Board with a statement of expenditures for each reef.

To date four pier reef projects have been initiated under this program, as follows:

Cabrillo Beach Pier, City of Los Angeles

Completed August, 1973

Cost: \$813 for purchase of material.

Santa Cruz Pier

Completed January, 1974

Cost: Final cost accounting not yet received.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
February 26, 1974

Imperial Beach Pier

Initiated 2-27-73

Status: 50% completed - Scheduled completion date 8-30-74.

Port Hueneme

Initiated July 18, 1973

Status: 20% completed - Scheduled completion date 7-17-74.

There has been recent interest in also developing offshore tire reefs in a similar manner. Ventura County interests have been working with the assistance of the Department of Fish and Game and the Ventura Port District to redevelop the Ventura Marina Reef with tire clusters. This offshore reef was constructed of quarry rock by WCB in 1965 but evidently was covered with silt and sand from the flood of 1969.

Staff also has had preliminary discussions with Ventura County representatives regarding a proposal to develop an offshore tire reef near Channel Islands Harbor, and Mr. McClellan from Ventura County has today provided a report on a proposed plan for reef construction off the Ventura County coast.

Neither of these project would qualify under the present reef program because they are offshore instead of pier locations. It appears desirable to broaden the program authorization to include offshore tire reefs.

Additional flexibility under the program to add suitable, economical materials other than tires to the reefs also would be desirable. As an example, the Department of Fish and Game is presently planning to sink a Navy surplus steel barge to supplement an existing reef. A problem of availability of funds for towing and sinking this barge reportedly has been solved, but could prevent capitalizing on such opportunities in the future. Being able to coordinate the acquiring and sinking of such barges with a tire reef project so that tire clusters could be loaded on the barge before it is towed out and sunk would be very desirable.

To further update the reef program, recognition should be given to rapidly escalating costs. Most WCB costs in the program will be for plastic rope and equipment rentals, both of which are directly affected by the shortages and rising costs of petroleum based products. To continue participation in such projects at approximately the same level of effectiveness, increase from the \$2,000 limitation per project to \$3,000 will probably be needed.

It was Mr. Hart's recommendation that the Board broaden the authorization for this program to include offshore ocean reefs and suitable materials other than tires and increase the limitation to \$3,000 per individual reef. Other program criteria would remain the same including that any reef project in excess of \$3,000 be brought to the Board for review and approval. Reports on individual projects undertaken and costs would be provided to the Board.



Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
February 26, 1974

Senator Lagomarsino in his review of the agenda indicated he favored broadening the reef program criteria. Mr. Hart assured Senator Marler that in part because of the necessity to secure State Lands and Corps of Engineers permits and to process an EIR, there would not be indiscriminate dumping of undesirable materials in the ocean.

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR MARLER, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN POWERS, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD BROADEN THE AUTHORIZATION FOR THE REEF PROGRAM AS APPROVED AT THE MARCH 23, 1972, MEETING TO INCLUDE OFFSHORE OCEAN REEFS, USE OF MATERIALS OTHER THAN TIRES, AND INCREASE THE LIMITATION TO \$3,000 PER INDIVIDUAL REEF. ALL OTHER CRITERIA OF THE ORIGINAL PROGRAM WILL REMAIN THE SAME, INCLUDING A REPORT TO THE BOARD OF EACH PROJECT UNDERTAKEN AND A STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURES FOR EACH REEF DEVELOPED UNDER THIS REEF PROGRAM.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ARNETT, SECONDED BY MR. FRYER, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD HEREBY BROADEN THE AUTHORIZATION FOR THE REEF PROGRAM AS APPROVED AT THE MARCH 23, 1972, MEETING TO INCLUDE OFFSHORE REEFS, USE OF MATERIALS OTHER THAN TIRES, AND INCREASE THE LIMITATION TO \$3,000 PER INDIVIDUAL REEF. ALL OTHER CRITERIA OF THE ORIGINAL PROGRAM WILL REMAIN THE SAME, INCLUDING A REPORT TO THE BOARD OF EACH PROJECT UNDERTAKEN AND A STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURES FOR EACH REEF DEVELOPED UNDER THIS REEF PROGRAM.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

14. Whittier-Narrows Fishing Lakes Expansion, Los Angeles County \$358,500.00

Mr. Hart reviewed that the County of Los Angeles and the WCB in 1956 cooperated in the original development of the Whittier-Narrows Dam Recreation Area for fishing purposes. The Board allocated \$500,674 for the project, including dredging to ground water level in the San Gabriel River Basin to form an 86-acre lake. The County at its cost further developed the area for recreational use.

The initial Legg Lake project has provided convenient fishing recreation for the several million people in the Los Angeles basin. Trout, channel catfish, and other warmwater fish are stocked by the Department of Fish and Game, and the area is open to free public fishing. The project is located within the metropolitan complex just 15 miles east of the city civic center, and last year the county reported 1,812,700 visitor days of use at this area.

To help meet the heavy demands for close-in public fishing opportunities, the County of Los Angeles has proposed WCB participation in a project which will similarly develop two lakes tributary and adjacent to Legg Lake. The original concept of lake development has changed because ground

water levels fluctuate and water supplies for lake level maintenance by pumping or surface run-off are limited. The County installed a plastic liner in Legg Lake several years ago for water conservation and lake level maintenance purposes, which has proven satisfactory.

The proposal includes installing a plastic liner in the existing 12-acre Center Lake, and converting a highway fill borrow pit (North Lake) to a 22-acre fishing lake by similar development. Facilities to improve the supply and quality of both pumped ground water and surface water inflow to these lakes are also included in the project. These improvements will provide 1.3 miles of shoreline for added fishing opportunities for the people of the greater Los Angeles metropolitan area.

Additional improvements for general recreational purposes, public health and safety, such as comfort stations, parking areas, picnic facilities, landscaping, lighting, walks, access roads, fencing, and sewerage will be provided at county cost. The County estimates the total capital outlay for these developments in the Whittier-Narrows complex at over \$2,000,000.

The cost estimate for the fishing lake development portion of the project from information provided by the County is summarized as follows:

Center and North Lakes - dewatering, excavation & lining	\$591,000
Low flow by-pass	115,800
Water development - low pressure outlets, booster pumps, operational controls, etc.	<u>10,200</u>

Total estimated joint project costs . . . . . \$717,000

Proposed WCB share . . . . . 358,500

An application has been made to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation for Land and Water Conservation funds from the remaining 1973-74 WCB allotment, conditional upon the approval of the Board. This early application was required so as to meet schedules imposed by BOR for commitment of 73-74 Federal L&WC funds. If this project qualifies, the Land and Water reimbursement would be shared equally between the County and WCB.

A resolution from the County Board of Supervisors has been received indicating their willingness to enter into the project on a cost-sharing basis, to transfer sufficient land rights to the state to satisfy the requirements of both the state and federal government and to operate and maintain the completed project as a public fishing area. County also has provided the planning and engineering for the project, has prepared the plans and will contract out and supervise the construction at county cost.

Los Angeles County as the lead agency for CEQA requirements has prepared and processed an Environmental Impact Report for the proposed project. The EIR has been reviewed by staff and has been reviewed and accepted in final form by the Department of Fish and Game and other public agencies having jurisdiction or interest.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
February 26, 1974

The EIR process brought out that development of the borrow pit (North Lake) for fishing and public use purposes necessarily would reduce wildlife habitat values. Plans were revised to maintain or redevelop as much wildlife habitat in this area as feasible. Also, agreement was reached between the Department of Fish and Game and the County for additional wildlife habitat development as a compensating measure. This development will be a separate project at County expense within the 127 acre Nature Center area adjacent to Legg Lake.

Mr. Hart recommended that the Board, after review and consideration of the project EIR, approve the Whittier-Narrows Fishing Lakes Improvement project, allocate \$358,500 therefor on a cost-sharing basis with the County of Los Angeles, and authorize the staff to proceed with the project substantially as planned, including the authorization for Land and Water Conservation Fund application. He mentioned that Mr. Hubert Duke from the Los Angeles County Parks Department was present to respond to questions from the Board.

Assemblywoman Davis asked if lining the lake would eliminate the natural forage for fish, and Mr. Hart explained that after the lake is lined, earth is put back in. This has been done at Legg Lake where satisfactory fishing has been experienced. It had been reported that a 25-pound catfish was caught in the lake which indicates sufficient food is available. This was confirmed by Mr. Arnett who stated that even though the process appeared very artificial, with sufficient earth put back in there will, in time, be sufficient food growth to support a large population of fish. This in turn will provide a tremendous amount of fishing in an area critically in need of this type of recreational facility.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYMAN POWERS, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYWOMAN DAVIS, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE WHITTIER-NARROWS FISHING LAKES EXPANSION PROJECT; ALLOCATE \$358,500 THEREFOR ON A COST-SHARING BASIS WITH THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED. STAFF IS FURTHER AUTHORIZED TO APPLY FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF JOINT COUNTY/WCB COSTS UNDER THE FEDERAL LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND PROGRAM, SUCH REIMBURSEMENT TO BE DIVIDED EQUALLY BETWEEN THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD AND THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ARNETT, SECONDED BY MR. FRYER, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD, AFTER REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF THE PROJECT EIR, APPROVE THE WHITTIER-NARROWS FISHING LAKES EXPANSION PROJECT; ALLOCATE \$358,500 THEREFOR ON A COST-SHARING BASIS WITH THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED. STAFF IS FURTHER AUTHORIZED TO APPLY FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF JOINT COUNTY/WCB COSTS UNDER THE FEDERAL LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND PROGRAM, SUCH REIMBURSEMENT TO BE DIVIDED EQUALLY BETWEEN THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD AND THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

15. Heeser Drive Fishing Access, Mendocino County  
Change in maintenance responsibilities

Over the period 1957 to 1968, the Wildlife Conservation Board acquired 26+ acres with approximately 2 miles of ocean frontage on the Mendocino coastline adjacent to the City of Mendocino. An access road, parking, and sanitary facilities were developed by WCB with operation and maintenance through a cooperative agreement with Mendocino County. WCB expenditures for the project have totalled \$84,960.

Heeser Drive has been a popular public use area. It provides access to abalone picking and rock fishing for sportsmen, but much of the use is by the general public to view, photograph, paint, or otherwise enjoy the scenic beauty of the rugged coastline in this area.

In recent years the State Department of Parks and Recreation has acquired the adjacent property so that their new Mendocino Headlands practically surrounds the WCB project on the land side. Parks is budgeting funds for initial operation of the area in the 1974-75 fiscal year.

In part because this area is somewhat remote from the county center of operations in Ukiah, the County has had problems with maintenance and vandalism. Parks has indicated a willingness to include operation and maintenance responsibilities for Heeser Drive with their operation of Mendocino Headlands. The County concurs with the proposed change.

WCB staff on the basis of letters from both Mr. Mott and the County has reached preliminary agreement on this matter with Department of Parks and Recreation and Mendocino County. Essentially, this would consist of entering into a new, long-term agreement with Parks for operation and maintenance of the area and facilities at no cost to WCB. The area would continue to be identified as Heeser Drive Fishing Access with appropriate signs crediting both WCB and Parks with respective roles in the project. Free public use of the WCB project area would continue.

Coincident with such an agreement becoming effective with Parks, the operation and maintenance agreement with the County would be terminated, with the provision that Heeser Drive access road would remain in the County road system as a public road maintained by the County.

The proposed change would be logical and more efficient. It would eliminate the need for both the County and State to maintain practically duplicating maintenance operations in the same area.

Mr. Hart recommended that the Board approve the proposed change in operation and maintenance responsibilities and authorize staff to proceed with execution of the necessary agreements substantially as planned.



Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
February 26, 1974

Assemblywoman Davis stated that it has always been the policy of the Board that the local agency's interest in a project would include operation and maintenance responsibilities for a certain number of years. It was her feeling that the Board might be opening the door here wherein local agencies might feel they could indicate interest at the outset, but in a few years request a change in O&M responsibilities based on what they consider unusual circumstances.

Mr. Arthur Kramer, Director, Mendocino County Department of Parks and Beaches, asked to speak on the proposal. He stated that his Department was formed about 8 months ago and in this time his department has tried to restore the facilities which have been badly vandalized. His department has the full potential of maintaining the area, although they are centered in Ukiah. Mr. Kramer felt the State Department of Parks and Recreation could operate and maintain the area better, however, since they have a headquarters at Russian Gulch, about 2 miles north of the area. In fact, State Parks and Recreation have control of almost the entire area on the land side of Heeser Drive. Park rangers are on constant patrol of the area and are considered the most logical people to take care of the area. If, however, the WCB feels it does not want to transfer this responsibility to the State Parks and Recreation Department, then his department would, he said, be willing to maintain it until such time as the contract expires.

In response to Senator Marler's inquiry, Mr. Hart stated this O&M contract was a 20 year agreement and that if not now terminated it will expire in 1978. Mr. Arnett asked what would normally happen at the end of the term and Mr. Hart advised that the staff would expect to extend the agreement with the County or negotiate with another agency such as Parks and Recreation for the operation and maintenance of the fishing access. The property is owned by the State so the State would retain title to the property and the improvements.

Mr. Arnett asked if Parks understand that they are not to charge for access. Mr. Hart responded that this was made clear to Parks and Recreation from the outset and has been the basis of discussions and understandings reached with Parks and Recreation. He added that Parks and Recreation would, in effect, take over the project under the same terms the County now operates under. The Chairman asked Mr. McCargo of the Department of Parks and Recreation if this was their understanding and Mr. McCargo stated that the Department is fully aware of this requirement regarding use of the WCB property. He said this particular project by the very nature of its layout lends itself very well to providing free fishing access to the ocean, and it would remain so. The fishing and park activity areas were clearly shown on the map displayed.

Mr. Kramer noted that the greatest problem of maintenance of the area was not so much the restroom facilities as it was the headlands themselves which are eroding because of the indiscriminate vehicular travel. They have made an effort to line the roads with telephone poles to restrict

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
February 26, 1974

travel. Mr. Hart felt that if Parks and Recreation were maintaining the area, this type of use could be more easily controlled because park rangers would be stationed on-site.

In response to Assemblywoman Davis' question, Mr. Hart stated that presently there are chemical toilets on the area as well as one permanent restroom facility. Parks and Recreation has indicated they would restore the permanent restroom and add a new one. Mr. McCargo corroborated this and reported that improvements planned by the Mendocino Public Utility District would enable Parks and Recreation to develop sanitary facilities which would be handled through a very sophisticated sewage treatment plant. The existing chemical toilets are county property and will be removed by the County when the new sanitary facilities are developed. The utility district has already received bids for the new sewer lines and treatment plant.

There was discussion about what additional costs would be incurred by the State in the operation and maintenance of Heeser Drive. Mr. McCargo stated that costs for its maintenance would be indistinguishable or unidentifiable from their overall operations costs for this coastal area. However, there would be one-time capital outlay anticipated by Parks and Recreation for the improvements to restroom facilities and for providing better control of vehicles on the headland area.

Both Senator Marler and Assemblywoman Davis again expressed concern about the precedent being set by permitting this change in operation and maintenance responsibilities, about the potential ramifications that they felt could be detrimental to the continued existence and identity of the WCB project and overall program.

Mr. McCargo considered that the objectives of the WCB which has acquired and developed the Heeser Drive Fishing Access for the protection and public enjoyment and use of the resources are the same as the State Department of Parks and Recreation. Discussion was had as to the best means of accomplishing the objective of maintaining the fishing access.

Senator Marler suggested that staff secure legal opinion to insure that Parks and Recreation would have peace officer status as necessary on the Heeser Drive project area. He also suggested that the County be allowed to negotiate a contract with State Parks to operate and maintain the area. He wanted to make certain that the face of the action, whatever form it might take indicate clearly that State Parks was picking up what was a recognized county function. The Chairman directed staff to check out the legality of any proposed agreement and clearly indicate therein that State Parks was picking up a county function.

Assemblywoman Davis stated that it may appear to the Chairman that the WCB legislative members were being overly sensitive about this problem. However, she said, it has been the experience of the Board that it must be careful not to lose any of its ability to function as it has. She recommended that the Board staff consider all the items that have been discussed,

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
February 26, 1974

and secure further facts and information and bring it back at the next meeting, or members could be polled prior to final agreement so that this will not be delayed.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYWOMAN DAVIS, SECONDED BY MR. ARNETT, AS A JOINT MOTION, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD STAFF SECURE CLARIFICATION OF THE LEGALITY OF THE PROCEDURE TO CHANGE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE RESPONSIBILITIES FROM THE COUNTY OF MENDOCINO TO THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION, AND PROVIDE THIS INFORMATION AND THE PROPOSED ACTION TO THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD AND JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE MEMBERS FOR THEIR CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL PRIOR TO FINAL NEGOTIATIONS. PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

16. Central Valleys Pilot Striped Bass Hatchery, Sacramento County \$64,000.00

Mr. Hart presented the proposal for an experimental striped bass hatchery to be located at the Central Valleys Hatchery in Elk Grove.

For a number of years the Department of Fish and Game has experimentally stocked striped bass in selected California reservoirs and in the lower Colorado River. The stripers evidently have survived well in most of the new waters, and in some cases have provided a unique and highly popular trophy fishery. Stripers up to 40 pounds have been caught in the Colorado River near Blythe, and fish in the 2 to 28 pound range have been taken in Millerton Lake, Lake Mendocino, Camp Far West Reservoir, Black Butte Reservoir, and San Antonio Reservoir.

The Department has concluded that striped bass are desirable species for reservoir fisheries management purposes, both as a trophy fish and as a predator to control overpopulations of other fish. Other experimental use of stripers is planned, including stocking in selected southern California coastal waters to improve ocean sport fishing.

Although the survival and growth rate of the transplanted stripers has been good, reproduction in the new waters has evidently been poor and inadequate to maintain the new fisheries. Maintenance stocking will be necessary.

The Department has considered it inadvisable to take relatively large numbers of young striped bass from the Delta area for a continuing maintenance stocking program in other waters, not wishing to possibly jeopardize the main striped bass fishery in the state.

For three years the Department has been experimenting with artificial spawning and rearing of striped bass, after some of the southeastern states enjoyed some success with such efforts. Mature stripers are caught during the spawning run in spring, held in tanks and artificially ripened with hormone injections. A large female will produce as many as two million eggs.



Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
February 26, 1974

Facilities for taking and hatching eggs and starting the rearing process for very small fish have been provided by the Department and the Dingell-Johnson federal aid in fisheries restoration program as part of an experimental striped bass hatchery project at the Central Valleys fish hatchery near Elk Grove.

The Department has proposed a WCB project to expand the experimental facility to a pilot hatchery aimed at producing 150,000 yearling striped bass and/or largemouth black bass annually for stocking purposes. Required facilities consist primarily of a well for additional water supply, and conversion of existing tanks to 36 raceway ponds for rearing purposes. The ponds would also be used for experimental rearing of largemouth bass for stocking in reservoirs with apparent spawning failure and subsequent loss of a year class.

The Department has provided a cost estimate that has been reviewed by staff and found acceptable as follows:

Drill and case 16 inch well	\$22,000
100 H.P. turbine pump, installation and wiring	15,000
Standby engine with right angle drive, installed	4,000
Install power poles and lines	3,500
Pipe and fittings for supply and drain line	5,000
Material for pump house and forms	2,000
Concrete	1,200
Equipment rental	500
Subtotal	\$53,200
Contingency, 20%	10,800
Total Estimated Cost	\$64,000

The Department has determined that the proposed project will have an insignificant effect on the environment and does not come under the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

Mr. Hart recommended the Board approve this project, allocate \$64,000 therefor, and authorize staff and the Department to proceed substantially as planned. He informed the Board that the staff had received a letter from a Mr. George Ray protesting the establishment of this hatchery, and suggesting that these fish can be purchased by the state from private producers for less.

Discussion by Board members brought out that this is an experimental hatchery and as such would not be in competition with nor preclude operations by a private fish breeder.

Mr. Arnett noted that Mr. Bill Schafer, Supervisor of Fish Hatcheries, was present and could answer any specific questions regarding the proposal. Mr. Arnett believed that the production of striped bass is similar to trout production. Although the State produces its own trout for planting there are a number of private trout breeders in the state selling fish to their customers, and the Department is glad to have this supplemental source. However, the State cannot depend upon the vagaries of the private breeders to meet the State's planting demands.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
February 26, 1974

Senator Marler remarked that he had been receiving letters from individuals concerned that the striped bass in the Sacramento River are the major predators of salmon and steelhead and asked if it were planned to plant striped bass in the river. Mr. Arnett responded that this was not planned.

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR MARLER, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYWOMAN DAVIS, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE CENTRAL VALLEYS PILOT STRIPED BASS HATCHERY, SACRAMENTO COUNTY; ALLOCATE \$64,000 THEREFOR; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ARNETT, SECONDED BY MR. FRYER, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE CENTRAL VALLEYS PILOT STRIPED BASS HATCHERY, SACRAMENTO COUNTY; ALLOCATE \$64,000 THEREFOR; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

(Mr. Fryer was excused from the meeting at this time.)

17. Putah Creek Fishing Access Expansion, Yolo County \$55,645.00

Mr. Hart reported that in 1964 the WCB purchased 60 acres of land which included  $2\frac{1}{2}$  miles of frontage on Putah Creek below Lake Berryessa. Development of parking areas, sanitary facilities, and fencing was also completed that year and the project turned over to Yolo County for operation and maintenance.

Putah Creek is open to year-round trout fishing and is one of the most popular streams in this part of the State. It is within an hour's drive of both the San Francisco and Sacramento areas. In 1965, there were 78,000 user days recorded. This use has grown steadily and now exceeds 150,000 annually.

Because of this increased usage, the WCB acquired an additional 22 acre parcel in 1972, contiguous to the existing project on the downstream end. Previously authorized negotiations are also under way with the Bureau of Reclamation to use some of their adjoining land for project purposes. The County of Yolo has now requested WCB development of public use facilities on these parcels and would operate the area as part of the initial project.

An Environmental Impact Report for the proposed development has been prepared by staff with County assistance and has been provided to the Board with agenda material. The EIR has been circulated among all interested local and state agencies, and it has been determined there will be no significant adverse effect upon the environment caused by project development.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
February 26, 1974

Development would include parking, access roads, a water system, sanitary facilities, and fencing. As enhancing features, the County will supply picnic tables, barbecue units, and other day use facilities.

Preliminary plans and a cost estimate have been provided by the County and reviewed by staff. These have been found acceptable, and the cost is as follows:

Roads and parking areas	\$25,000
Water system	12,000
Sanitary facilities	6,000
Fencing	3,000
A&E	2,300
Contingencies	<u>7,345</u>

TOTAL \$55,645

Mr. Hart recommended that the Board, with consideration of the EIR, approve this project, allocate \$55,645 therefor, and authorize staff to proceed substantially as proposed, including applying for Land and Water Conservation Fund reimbursement. He advised that Assemblyman John Dunlap had written urging favorable consideration of this item.

Assemblywoman Davis asked if the Board staff had been successful in securing Bureau of Reclamation lease of properties, and Mr. Hart responded that it had been possible to secure such leases, such as at Dog Island in Redding, and that in the recent expansion of that project particularly, the Bureau has been very cooperative.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYWOMAN DAVIS, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN POWERS, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD, AFTER REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF THE PROJECT EIR, APPROVE THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT FOR EXPANSION OF THE PUTAH CREEK FISHING ACCESS, YOLO COUNTY; ALLOCATE \$55,645 THEREFOR; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED, INCLUDING AUTHORIZATION TO APPLY FOR FEDERAL LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUNDS.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS REGULARLY MOVED AND SECONDED THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD, AFTER REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF THE PROJECT EIR, APPROVE THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT FOR EXPANSION OF THE PUTAH CREEK FISHING ACCESS, YOLO COUNTY; ALLOCATE \$55,645 THEREFOR; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED, INCLUDING AUTHORIZATION TO APPLY FOR FEDERAL LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUNDS.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

18. Martinez Public Fishing Pier - Augmentation \$35,000.00  
Contra Costa County

Mr. Hart reported that at the July 25, 1968, meeting the Board approved the City of Martinez request for a matching fund project to rehabilitate the old Martinez ferry slip and allocated \$30,000 as its share of the estimated \$60,000 cost of the project.

The pier is within easy walking distance from residential areas in central Martinez and a short drive from a large surrounding population. Heavy use is expected. Some fishing presently is done from the pier primarily for striped bass, flounders, and sturgeon. The structure is unsafe, however, and must be renovated or removed.

Although the City's intention at the time this proposal was first presented to the Board was to proceed with the project, the budgeting of the City's share of the costs was delayed because of related but separate issues involving the adjacent city marina. The City justifiably felt the problems associated with the marina would have to be resolved before proceeding with the pier restoration, since both are integral and complementing parts of the City's waterfront recreational complex.

Subsequent to the approval of the Board in 1968, the City engaged the firm of Daniel, Mann, Johnson, and Mendenhall to make a survey of the entire waterfront area. As an outgrowth of the report made by DMJM, a pile-strength survey was conducted. The recommended restoration work resulting from the more detailed engineering studies was somewhat more extensive than originally planned.

The revised recommendations for restoration coupled with the construction cost escalation over the past 5½ years have joined to increase the project costs to more than double the original estimate. Staff has reviewed the plans and cost estimate and believes them to be adequate and in accordance with the original scope of the work as previously approved.

The estimated costs as of December, 1973, are as follows:

Remove selected structural components & salvage	\$30,000
Jack, splice and shim pilings	20,000
Replace decking	10,000
Construct fishing platform	13,000
Install new lateral and longitudinal bracing	4,000
Construct railing	13,500
Replace water fire protection main	3,000
Electrical work, light standards	8,000
Benches and fish cleaning tables	3,000
Asphaltic concrete deck surfacing	5,500
Remove excess piling and cleanup	8,000

Total Estimated Project Costs \$130,000



Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
February 26, 1974

The issues involving the marina have been resolved and the City has budgeted their share of funds to undertake the fishing pier project. The proposed work is the minimum recommended to provide a safe public fishing facility. The public need is as great or greater than ever for this type of facility in Martinez.

The City has determined that the rehabilitation of this existing structure as proposed will have no significant environmental impact and, as lead agency, has processed a Negative Declaration in accordance with the procedures and requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

It was Mr. Hart's recommendation the Board, with consideration of the negative declaration, approve the supplemental allocation of \$35,000 for this project and authorize staff to proceed substantially as planned, including applying for matching Land and Water funds for the joint City/WCB costs on the project. He mentioned that Assemblyman Boatwright had written a letter in support of this proposal, and that Mr. Henry Van Dyke, City Engineer for the City of Martinez, was present to provide supplemental information if it were needed.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYMAN POWERS, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYWOMAN DAVIS, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD, WITH CONSIDERATION OF THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION, APPROVE THE SUPPLEMENTAL ALLOCATION OF \$35,000 FOR THE STATE'S SHARE OF THE INCREASED COSTS OF THE MARTINEZ PUBLIC FISHING PIER PROJECT, CONTRA COSTA COUNTY; AND AUTHORIZE STAFF TO PROCEED SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED. STAFF IS FURTHER AUTHORIZED TO APPLY FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF JOINT CITY/WCB COSTS UNDER THE FEDERAL LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND PROGRAM, SUCH REIMBURSEMENT TO BE DIVIDED EQUALLY BETWEEN THE WCB AND THE CITY OF MARTINEZ.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS REGULARLY MOVED AND SECONDED THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD, WITH CONSIDERATION OF THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION, APPROVE THE SUPPLEMENTAL ALLOCATION OF \$35,000 FOR THE STATE'S SHARE OF THE INCREASED COSTS OF THE MARTINEZ PUBLIC FISHING PIER PROJECT, CONTRA COSTA COUNTY; AND AUTHORIZE STAFF TO PROCEED SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED. STAFF IS FURTHER AUTHORIZED TO APPLY FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF JOINT CITY/WCB COSTS UNDER THE FEDERAL LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND PROGRAM, SUCH REIMBURSEMENT TO BE DIVIDED EQUALLY BETWEEN THE WCB AND THE CITY OF MARTINEZ.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

19. Rio Vista North Fishing Access, Solano County

Two parcels of land, Mr. Hart reported, totaling about  $3\frac{1}{2}$  acres on the right bank of the Sacramento River about one mile north of Rio Vista have become surplus to needs of the State Reclamation Board. In February of 1973, representatives of the City of Rio Vista, the County of Solano, and the Reclamation Board staff and Wildlife Conservation Board staff inspected the property. It was agreed there was good potential for fishing access development at this site. Subsequently, a resolution supporting a WCB development at this site, and agreeing to its operation upon development was received from the Solano County Board of Supervisors.

In some past instances the Reclamation Board has transferred surplus land parcels to the WCB or Department of Fish and Game for wildlife or fisheries purposes, free of charge. Examples are the Bridge Arbor project in Lake County and the Cliff House Fishing Access in Sacramento County, both of which were developed on parcels transferred to WCB by the Reclamation Board.

The Solano County Parks Department is prepared to develop a master plan for the area. Upon acquisition of the property from the Reclamation Board, staff would work with Solano County representatives to develop plans for an appropriate fishing access development for Board consideration and allocation of development funds at a future meeting.

Mr. Hart recommended the Board authorize application to the Reclamation Board for transfer of control and possession of the surplus land, and to proceed with the project substantially as planned. He advised that both Assemblyman Dunlap and Senator Behr had written letters in support of this proposal.

Senator Marler asked how close the next fishing access is and Mr. Hart responded that the closest fishing accesses are approximately one mile downstream in the City of Rio Vista, one near the City Hall which is a boat launching facility, and another approved project adjacent to the bridge for bank fishing on which the City of Rio Vista is ready to start construction. What is proposed here is only a bank fishing facility.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYWOMAN DAVIS, SECONDED BY MR. ARNETT, AS A JOINT MOTION, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD AUTHORIZE STAFF TO APPLY TO THE RECLAMATION BOARD FOR TRANSFER OF CONTROL AND POSSESSION OF THE SURPLUS LAND REQUIRED FOR THE RIO VISTA NORTH FISHING ACCESS, SOLANO COUNTY, AND TO PROCEED WITH DEVELOPMENT PLANS FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION BY THE BOARD FOR A FISHING ACCESS PROJECT UPON SUCH TRANSFER OF LANDS.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
February 26, 1974

20. Domestic Water Treatment Units \$26,100.00

Mr. Hart reviewed that the Wildlife Conservation Board on March 23, 1972, allocated \$100,000 for the purchase and installation of compact, packaged water treatment units at several installations that had been developed by the Board and are operated by the Department of Fish and Game.

The domestic water supply systems at a number of these installations were antiquated, ineffective, or costly to maintain and repair. Some installations had never had satisfactory domestic water for resident operations personnel. To date all except two of the water treatment units have been installed and are working well.

At the time of the initial proposal to the Board, it was explained the allocation was for six installations where the need was most critical, but there were other installations where the need was less urgent and for which allocations would later be requested. Along with these later requirements for domestic water filtration was the expectation that hatchery water discharges would have to be treated to meet State or Regional Water Quality Control Board standards. The WCB was advised that the additional domestic water treatment units together with treatment of hatchery discharge waters would be considered as a Phase 2 segment of this program.

The Department of Fish and Game has not yet received the minimum standards for hatchery water discharges and at the present time is operating under tentative guidelines. Until such time as the final discharge standards are prescribed, the WCB will not be requested to enter into Phase 2 of the water treatment program.

The Department has completed a statewide survey of other installations in need of the domestic treatment facilities. The request presented today is for two additional package domestic filters -- one at San Joaquin Hatchery and one at the Snow Mountain Egg Collecting Station. This will fulfill present needs.

The estimated cost to purchase and install these two units as determined by the Department Engineering Section is as follows:

San Joaquin Hatchery

\$17,100

50 gal/min. pkg. unit w/auto. backwash,  
chlorine, chemicals, building modifica-  
tions, misc. valves, fittings and  
connections.



Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
February 26, 1974

Snow Mountain Egg Collecting Station      \$ 9,000

10-15 gal/min. pkg. unit, pump 1,000  
gal. pressure tank, building modifica-  
tion, misc. valves, fittings and connec-  
tions.

Staff has determined that the installations of these filters will have no significant effect on the environment and are classed as activities which are categorically exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

It was Mr. Hart's recommendation that the Board approve the purchase and installation of domestic water treatment units for the two installations noted, allocate \$26,100 therefor, and authorize staff and the Department to proceed with the projects substantially as planned.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYWOMAN DAVIS, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN POWERS, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE PURCHASE AND INSTALLATION OF DOMESTIC WATER TREATMENT UNITS AT THE SAN JOAQUIN HATCHERY AND THE SNOW MOUNTAIN EGG COLLECTING STATION; ALLOCATE THE SUM OF \$26,100 TO AUGMENT THE PREVIOUS ALLOCATION OF MARCH 23, 1972, FOR DOMESTIC WATER TREATMENT UNITS; AND AUTHORIZE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECTS SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS REGULARLY MOVED AND SECONDED THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE PURCHASE AND INSTALLATION OF DOMESTIC WATER TREATMENT UNITS AT THE SAN JOAQUIN HATCHERY AND THE SNOW MOUNTAIN EGG COLLECTING STATION; ALLOCATE THE SUM OF \$26,100 TO AUGMENT THE PREVIOUS ALLOCATION OF MARCH 23, 1972, FOR DOMESTIC WATER TREATMENT UNITS; AND AUTHORIZE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECTS SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

21. 1974 Parks and Recreation Bond Act Program

Mr. Hart reported that Proposition 1 on the June 4, 1974, ballot will be the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Bond Act of 1974. Included in the Act is \$10,000,000 in supplemental funding to the Wildlife Conservation Board for acquisition or development of property for fish and wildlife conservation purposes.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
February 26, 1974

This will be the third bond act to provide supplemental funding for the WCB program. The comparable bond act of 1964 included \$5,000,000 for the WCB. A completion report was presented to the Board at its March 23, 1971, meeting on the accomplishments of this bond program. These consisted of developing three new fish hatcheries and expanding two existing hatcheries at a cost of \$4,126,118; acquiring 2,673 acres of fish and wildlife habitat to establish or enlarge five wildlife areas at a cost of \$687,883; constructing seven artificial reefs in Southern California ocean waters costing \$161,026; and miscellaneous costs for project assistance of \$24,973.

The Recreation and Fish and Wildlife Enhancement Bond Act of 1970 made available \$6,000,000 to the WCB and Department of Fish and Game. Use of these funds is limited to fish and wildlife enhancement and fishing access development in connection with State Water Project facilities. Again, a majority of these bond funds, about \$4,335,000 is planned for expansion of eight fish hatchery units to produce additional trout and channel catfish to stock State Project waters. Fishing access developments will cost about \$1,156,000, and \$509,000 is planned for fish and wildlife habitat development. Through the 1973-74 fiscal year, \$4,804,960 has been budgeted and \$596,000 is proposed for the 74-75 fiscal year, leaving \$599,040 yet unbudgeted but tentatively allocated.

Staff recommends a general program as outlined below, based in part on proposals by the Department of Fish and Game, for implementation of the 1974 Bond Act if approved by the voters in June. This would be a state-wide program of major priority projects in accordance with WCB policies and criteria. It would be intended to complement the Board's normal and continuing program carried out with the more limited annual allocation of pari-mutuel revenues.

1. Acquisition and Development of Key Fish and Wildlife Areas

This program would provide for purchase of key parcels of fish and wildlife habitat from private individuals or as surplus lands from public agencies. Although emphasis would be on land acquisition, included would be such development as may be necessary for management and appropriate public use. Acquisition would be on a negotiated, willing sale basis in accordance with long-standing Board policy; no condemnation actions are proposed.

This proposal represents an expansion or acceleration of the Board's long-term program of acquiring key areas for both protection and compatible public enjoyment of fish and wildlife resources. Emphasis will be on those habitat areas and wildlife species that are most threatened by continued development and urbanization.

At present it appears particularly timely and desirable to place emphasis on the acquisition program. Many natural areas that seemed destined to disappear through some form of development appear to have a new, but possibly temporary, lease on life. This is due in part to the slowdown in California's population growth and related development, but more directly to the recent environmental concerns that have placed restrictions on development, such as the Environmental Quality Act of 1970 and the Coastal Zone Initiative of 1972. Some lands previously planned for development or being held for speculation recently have become available at lowered appraised values.

The major categories of land acquisition proposed are as follows:

A. Marsh and Riparian Habitats

Both coastal and interior wetland areas and riparian vegetation along water courses have been disappearing more rapidly than other habitat types in California. At the same time, these areas are more important and productive for maintaining both game and non-game fish and wildlife and many other natural values than any other type of habitat.

B. Fisheries Habitat

Acquisition is proposed for key areas of fish habitat, primarily to maintain productive populations of native fish but with potentials to provide public fishing opportunity. Examples of such areas are spawning and nursery areas for salmon and steelhead, quality wild trout streams, and rare and endangered species habitat. Some purchases would include both fisheries and riparian or marsh habitat.

C. Deer and Bighorn Sheep Habitat

Preserving deer winter ranges is critical to the maintenance of migratory deer herds. Also, protecting key habitat areas is necessary to perpetuate California's remaining populations of bighorn sheep. Acquisition of selected areas of such habitat will prevent further encroachment by recreational subdivisions and other developments that threaten the well-being of both bighorn sheep and deer herds.

Deer winter range habitat acquired would generally be in central and Northern California, while bighorn sheep habitat would be primarily in desert and semi-desert areas of Southern California.

II. Fisheries Production and Enhancement

This program would consist primarily of Department of Fish and Game proposals for major capital outlay projects to meet remaining priority needs of the State's hatchery system or to enhance or restore desirable native fisheries.

A. Fish Production

Hatchery and related fish production facilities would be proposed to expand or provide more efficient production, with consideration given to priority needs for trout, salmon and steelhead, striped bass, and warmwater fish. In addition, consideration will be given to an experimental ocean fish hatchery to improve ocean and bay fishing primarily in Southern California.

B. Fisheries Enhancement

Developing additional artificial reefs in the ocean primarily south of Point Conception is proposed, to better ocean sport fishing in nearshore areas. This may include sinking of surplus Liberty ships for this purpose, if determined to be feasible.

Other projects to improve rivers or streams as natural game fish areas will be proposed, such as constructing barriers to prevent the upstream migration of competing, undesirable fish.

Upon approval of these general programs by the Board and voter approval of the Bond Act in the June, 1974, election, staff and the Department of Fish and Game will develop the first specific proposals for Board consideration at a following meeting. Approved proposals would be submitted through the annual budgeting process required by the act. Under this schedule the first Bond Act funds could become available to WCB in the 1975-76 fiscal year. The 1981-82 fiscal year budget would be the last in which such funds would be available in accordance with the act.

Mr. Hart recommended that the Legislative Committee and the Wildlife Conservation Board go on record as endorsing the '74 State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Bond Act and approving the proposed general program as outlined for WCB utilization of such funds upon passage of the Act.

Assemblywoman Davis commented that no doubt there would be acquisition of habitat lands for maintaining migratory deer herd in Northern California and asked what would be the outcome for the cattleman and sheepman when these lands are all acquired. Mr. Hart responded that these lands still could be leased for livestock grazing purposes. They would be under the operation and management of the Department of Fish and Game, and although



Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
February 26, 1974

priority would be for wildlife management purposes, many times the management of the vegetation that is most beneficial for deer and also reduction of grass for fire protection depends on some livestock grazing.

Assemblywoman Davis alluded to the problems that the cattlemen and sheepmen were having with the federal government in securing grazing leases. If the cattlemen were not permitted to utilize these lands acquired for wildlife purposes, their operation as a ranch unit may not be economically sound. Mr. Arnett declared that what the Department is suggesting would in no way conflict or downgrade the needs of the cattlemen and sheepmen for it was his experience that there is a great deal of compatibility. The Department stands ready to assist and support the cattlemen and sheepmen.

It was the consensus that the Board go on record as endorsing the '74 recreation bond proposal but not specifically the suggested breakdown as presented. It was felt the program outlined by staff could be of value in explaining some of the ways the money would be spent in the event specific questions were raised.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ARNETT, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYWOMAN DAVIS, AS A JOINT MOTION, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD GO ON RECORD AS ENDORSING PROPOSITION NO. 1, THE STATE BEACH, PARK, RECREATIONAL, AND HISTORICAL FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1974, AND THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO ISSUE SUCH A STATEMENT IN ITS BEHALF.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

22. Other Business

Yuba River Fishing Access, Yuba County \$8,600.00

The two items listed under Other Business, the Ellwood Pier and Fannon Dam, were informational items, but in view of the length of the agenda Mr. Hart requested that they be withdrawn. However, he requested that the Yuba River Fishing Access project be included under Other Business.

This project was approved by the WCB at its last meeting and \$27,000 was allocated for development. It is in cooperation with Yuba County and is located immediately across the river from Marysville, and is a popular shad fishing area. The County opened bids on this project yesterday and the low bid exceeded the amount available. There were three bids and the low bid was \$29,404, from Baldwin Construction Company. Costs have increased considerably in the last year since the project was approved, particularly for this type of project which consists of an access road and parking area development. Asphaltic concrete and other petroleum-based products account for a substantial part of

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
February 26, 1974

this project's cost. In view of the low bid and insufficiency of funds to proceed with the project, he recommended that the Board allocate an additional \$8,600 for development of the project. This will be a total of \$35,600 for the project which would meet the low bid, pay for costs already incurred on the project and allow a small contingency.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYMAN POWERS, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYWOMAN DAVIS, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD ALLOCATE AN ADDITIONAL \$8,600 TO MEET THE LOW BID FOR THE YUBA RIVER FISHING ACCESS PROJECT, AND THE STAFF IS AUTHORIZED TO PROCEED AS PLANNED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS REGULARLY MOVED AND SECONDED THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD ALLOCATE AN ADDITIONAL \$8,600 TO MEET THE LOW BID FOR THE YUBA RIVER FISHING ACCESS PROJECT AND THE STAFF IS AUTHORIZED TO PROCEED AS PLANNED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned by the Chairman at 4:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Chester M. Hart*

Chester M. Hart  
Executive Officer

## PROGRAM STATEMENT

At the close of the meeting on February 26, 1974, the amount allocated to projects since the Wildlife Conservation Board's inception in 1947, totaled \$34,793,748.77. This total includes \$4,230,119.66 reimbursed by the Federal Government under the Accelerated Public Works Program completed in 1966, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Program, the Anadromous Fish Act Program, and the Pittman-Robertson Program.

The statement includes projects completed under the 1964 State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Bond Act.

a. Fish Hatchery and Stocking Projects . . . . .	\$10,208,521.47
b. Fish Habitat Development and Improvement Projects . . . . .	3,916,316.23
1. Reservoir Construction or Improvement . . . . .	\$2,125,338.63
2. Stream Clearance and Improvement . . . . .	243,013.03
3. Stream Flow Maintenance Dams . . . . .	439,503.32
4. Marine Habitat . . . . .	270,779.36
5. Fish Screens, Ladders and Weir Projects . . . . .	837,681.89
c. Fishing Access Projects . . . . .	10,715,538.74
1. Coastal Access . . . . .	1,092,273.23
2. River, Stream and Bay Access . . . . .	2,926,649.79
3. Lake, Reservoir & Salton Sea Access . . . . .	22,705,652.18
4. Piers . . . . .	3,990,963.54
d. Game Farm Projects . . . . .	146,894.49
e. Game Habitat Development and Improvement Projects . . . . .	8,899,118.72
1. Wildlife Areas . . . . .	8,460,669.60
2. Miscellaneous Game Habitat Development . . . . .	438,449.12
f. Hunting Access . . . . .	472,436.81
g. Miscellaneous Projects . . . . .	401,422.31
s. Special Project Allocations . . . . .	33,500.00
Total Allocated to Projects . . . . .	\$34,793,748.77

## STATUS OF FUNDS Wildlife Restoration Fund

Unallocated balance at close of 5/1/73 meeting . . . . .	\$187,581.88
Plus interest on surplus money, Jan./Dec. 1973 . . . . .	+ 184,885.70
Plus unexpended balance 70/71 support . . . . .	+ 11,874.03
Plus miscellaneous revenue . . . . .	+ 1,323.00
Plus appropriation made available July 1, 1973 . . . . .	+ 750,000.00
Less estimated 73/74 oper. costs, adjusted . . . . .	- 175,075.00
Less prior allocation (Gray Lodge Wildlife Area) . . . . .	- 615,000.00
Unallocated balance at start of 2/26/74 meeting . . . . .	\$345,589.61
Plus recovery of funds . . . . .	+ 458,340.93
Less allocation . . . . .	- 634,645.00
Unallocated balance at close of 2/26/74 meeting . . . . .	\$169,285.54