

AGENDA

ASSEMBLY BUDGET SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3 NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Assemblymember Fran Pavley, Chair

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 26, 2003
STATE CAPITOL, ROOM 447
8:30 A.M.

ITEMS TO BE HEARD

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
	SUBCOMMITTEE OVERSIGHT ISSUES	3
3340	CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS	4
Issue 1	Proposed General Fund Reduction	4
Issue 2	Additional Proposals	5
Issue 3	Capital Outlay Proposals	6
3540	DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION	7
Issue 1	LAO Item: Fire and Timber Harvest Fees	7
Issue 2	LAO Item: Resources Assessment	8
Issue 3	Computer Aided Dispatch System	9
Issue 4	General Fund Reduction	9
Issue 5	Fund Shift From General Fund to Proposition 50: CALFED	10
Issue 6	Additional Departmental Proposals	10
Issue 7	Capital Outlay Proposals	11

3600	DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME	12
Issue 1	Public Resources Account Funding Reduction	12
Issue 2	Federal Funding: Grant Programs	13
Issue 3	Office of Spill Prevention Response (OSPR)	13
Issue 4	Additional Departmental Proposals	14
Issue 5	Proposition 50 Proposals	14
3640	WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD	15
Issue 1	LAO Item: Bond Funding	15
Issue 2	Proposition 50 Proposal	16
Issue 3	Additional Proposals	17
	COMMITTEE MEMBERS' ISSUES	17

SUBCOMMITTEE OVERSIGHT ISSUES

Many challenges face the legislature this year in reviewing and adopting the budget. Natural resources and environmental protection are one of the few areas of the budget that receive less general fund than five years ago. These programs have benefited from voter approved bond funds in the last three years for investment in California's water quality, water supply, watersheds, habitat and parks.

This year the Legislature must be more thorough and critical in its review of every program to determine priorities and identify programs that should be streamlined to eliminate duplication.

To assist the Subcommittee in reviewing the budget, several actions are being taken: The chairs and vice chairs of the relevant policy committees have been invited to participate in the subcommittee hearings; Four joint hearings with the policy committee to further explore key areas have been scheduled; and, Questions have been communicated to each agency and department to get a better understanding of funding levels, expenditure trends and priorities.

From each agency and department, the Subcommittee has asked for the following information:

- The level of funding and PYs for your department and divisions within your department for 1998-99, 2000-01, 2002-03 and proposed budget.
- A list of which divisions or programs are funded by general fund.
- What actions were taken either voluntarily or by direction from the Governor in the last year to reduce expenditures?
- How have administrative expenses including travel and attendance at conferences been reduced? How has the OE & E schedule been reduced?
- What statutorily mandated work has not been done in the last year because of budget reductions? Has this work been deferred or stopped? If deferred, when do you anticipate completing it?
- How were priorities established for the funding reductions? What are those priorities?
- What programs did you consider shifting funding source including shifting to a fee basis? If you chose not to make the shift to fees, what was the basis of that decision? What programs could be shifted to a fee basis in order to replace general fund?
- If you were given a 10% additional unallocated cut what programs would you defer or eliminate?

For each Budget Change Proposal:

- What is the purpose of the program and the source of funding?
- How does this funding level and source compare to prior years?
- Does the program have sufficient resources to meet its statutory obligations?
- What is the impact of the requested change in level or source of funding?
- Does this result in a reduction of positions or consulting dollars? If positions were eliminated, were the positions filed or vacant, limited term or permanent?
- If funding was reduced, why is this considered a lesser priority?
- Are there statutory changes that would remove implementation barriers to the program and allow you to better achieve program objectives with fewer resources?

3340 - CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS

The California Conservation Corps (CCC) assists federal, state and local agencies, and nonprofit entities in conserving and improving California’s natural resources while providing employment, training, and educational opportunities for young men and women. The CCC provides more than three million hours of conservation work each year. In addition to tree planting, stream clearance, trail building, park development, landscaping, energy conservation, forest improvements, plant nursery operations, and wildlife habitat restoration, the CCC responds to emergencies caused by fires, floods, earthquakes, and other natural disasters. The annualized corpsmember population for 2003–04 is estimated to be 1,400.

CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS
(dollars in thousands)

FUND	CURRENT YEAR 2002-03	BUDGET YEAR 2003-04	CHANGE	
			AMOUNT	PERCENT
General Fund	\$46,171	\$36,815	-\$9,356	-20.2%
Collins-Dugan Fund	34,349	27,320	-7029	-20.5%
Proposition 12	3,525	3,525	0	0
Proposition 40	4,071	5,224	1,153	28.3%
Public Buildings				
Construction Fund	10,972	44,420	33,448	305%
Other	544	593	49	9%
Federal Trust Fund	495	503	8	1.6%
TOTAL	\$100,127	\$118,400	\$18,273	18.3%
Personnel Years	501.8	445.7	-56.1	-11.2%
Corpsmembers	1,725	1,400	-325	-18.8%

ISSUE 1: PROPOSED GENERAL FUND REDUCTION

The Governor's 2003-04 budget proposes General Fund reductions to the Conservation Corps totaling \$11.58 million, approximately 59 positions, and 128 corpsmember positions.

The nature of these reductions include:

- \$2.30 million through the elimination of benefits for corpsmembers.
- \$3.23 million reduction of administration positions;
- \$846,000 for the elimination of local conservation corps grants;
- \$1.94 million through the closures of two residential facilities and the elimination of 128 corpsmember positions; and
- \$3.26 million in operating expenses.

BACKGROUND:

According to the Corps, this proposal reflects a directive to achieve a 25% reduction in General Fund expenditures. This proposal would reduce the Corps' ranks to approximately 1400 members, eliminate health benefits currently provided to these members, and eliminate the grants to local conservation corps statewide.

Since 2001-02, the Conservation Corps has seen all funds reduced from \$93.1 million to a proposed \$74.0 million, and General Fund support reduced from \$62.8 million to a proposed \$36.8 million in the Budget Year.

COMMENTS:

This proposal seems like a very drastic way to achieve a relatively minimal General Fund savings. \$2.3 million (General Fund) provides health benefits for 1400 corpsmembers, who provide services to other State departments, Federal government agencies, and to the public in general. \$846,00 in local grants provides \$73,000 for each of the local corps (East Bay, Los Angeles, San Francisco, San Jose, Sacramento, Long Beach, Tulare, Marin, San Diego, Orange County, Fresno) for baseline operations and priorities of these local corps.

The Subcommittee may wish to look at this proposal thoroughly and evaluate if there are options to continue funding for some or all of the areas proposed for reduction here.

ISSUE 2: ADDITIONAL PROPOSALS

The Governor's 2003-04 budget proposes two additional changes (Propositions 12 and 40) to the Conservation Corps' funding for activities associated with resource conservation projects.

- **Proposition 40.** \$5.22 million for direct resource conservation projects (\$1.15 million) and for grants to local community conservation corps programs for resource conservation projects (\$4.0 million).
- **Proposition 12.** \$3.5 million for fourth-year funding for direct resource conservation projects (\$625,000) and for grants to local community conservation corps programs for resource conservation projects (\$2.9 million).

BACKGROUND:

Propositions 12 and 40 both authorized specific funding for resource conservation projects, \$5.0 million in Proposition 40 and \$15.0 million in Proposition 12.

COMMENTS:

These proposals are consistent with the direction and intent of the Bond Acts, which provide funds for these activities of the Corps.

ISSUE 3: CAPITAL OUTLAY PROPOSALS

The Governor's 2003-04 budget proposes two capital outlay projects to be funded from lease revenue bonds. These proposals include:

- **Sequoia District Facility.** \$14.4 million for planning, working drawings, and construction costs to relocate the facility from the Porterville Developmental Center to a location in Tulare County. This relocation is necessary due to an increased population at the Developmental Center.
- **Tahoe Base Center.** \$18.4 million for the costs of acquisition, planning, working drawings, and construction of a new facility in the Tahoe Basin. The Department of General Services recommended relocation due to various inadequacies, including health and safety, of the existing facility.

COMMENTS:

The Legislative Analyst has raised several issues with the Corps' capital outlay proposals and recommends the following budget bill language to ensure adequate oversight of the projects by the Legislature.

Item 3340-301-0660**Provisions:**

(8) Funds appropriated in Schedule (2) of this Item shall only be available for expenditure if a related Department of Developmental Services capital outlay project in Schedule (2) of Item 4300-301-0660 is approved by the Legislature.

(9) Site acquisition funds appropriated in Schedule (1) shall be used to acquire a site for the Tahoe Base Center in the Meyers/South Lake Tahoe area.

Additionally, the Legislative Analyst has raised concern with the possibility of changes in the scope or schedule of these projects, and recommends the following language:

Provisions:

(10) "The Department of Finance will provide written notification to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, within ten days of receipt, of any requests for an augmentation of project costs, change in project scope, and any related change in project schedule, for projects identified in Schedules (1) and (2)."

3540 - DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION

The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF) protects the people of California from fires, responds to emergencies, and protects and enhances forest, range, and watershed values, providing social, economic, and environmental benefits to rural and urban citizens. CDF also provides protection of lives and property through the development and application of fire prevention engineering, enforcement and education.

The Governor's proposed 2003-04 budget requests \$671.5 million for State operations, local assistance, and capital outlay expenditures.

FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION
(dollars in thousands)

FUND	CURRENT YEAR 2002-03	BUDGET YEAR 2003-04	CHANGE	
			AMOUNT	PERCENT
General Fund	\$486,459	\$413,789	-\$72,670	-15%
Bond Funds	59,550	69,946	10,396	17%
Federal Fund	20,122	22,508	2,386	12%
Other Funds	151,303	165,224	13,921	9%
TOTAL	\$717,434	\$671,467	-\$45,967	-6%
Personnel Years	5,182.9	5,129.5	-53.4	-1%

ISSUE 1: LAO ITEM: FIRE AND TIMBER HARVEST FEES

The Legislative Analyst has, in the *Analysis of the 2003-04 Budget Bill*, provided information relating to two separate proposals which it believes could shift State General Fund costs to beneficiaries of the State services. These proposals include:

- **Fire Suppression Fees in State Responsibility Areas.** This proposal provides several options current in place in other states, that assess fees on land-owners in state responsibility areas (SRA), to support CDF's growing costs of fire suppression activities in SRAs.
- **Timber Harvest Fees.** This proposal would assess a fee, based on the yield-value of timber harvested, to support State activities that review Timber Harvest Plans that are required to be submitted by timber harvesters.

COMMENTS:

The Legislative Analyst had done a significant write-up on this issue in the *Analysis of the 2003-04 Budget Bill*, and has been asked to provide additional material for the Subcommittee. The Legislative Analyst should present these proposals to the Members for discussion.

ISSUE 2: LAO ITEM: RESOURCE ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES

CDF provides fire protection services on timberlands and rangelands, owned privately or by state or local agencies. In addition, CDF regulates timber harvesting on forestland owned privately or by the state and provides a variety of resource management activities on these lands. As part of these responsibilities, CDF compiles and assesses data related to California's forest and rangelands. Statute requires CDF to conduct an assessment of these lands and to report its findings every five years to the Secretary for Resources and the Board of Forestry. The latest assessment report was due in January 2002, but has yet to be completed. The department, however, anticipates this report will be released soon.

BACKGROUND:

LAO Recommendation. The LAO is recommending the enactment of legislation requiring (1) the department to include an analysis of the costs and benefits of various resource management policies as part of its assessment activities; and (2) the resource assessment information collected by the department be made more readily available to the timber harvest program.

1. The LAO recommends that the statute requiring the five-year forest and rangeland assessment report explicitly require the department to analyze the costs and benefits of a range of forest and rangeland management policy options as part of the report.
2. Additionally, they recommend that the Legislature amend statute governing the department's forest and rangeland assessment program to specify that relevant resource assessment information shall be made readily available to the timber harvest review program.

Additional LAO Recommendation. The Legislative Analyst is recommending the elimination of the Sierra Nevada Initiative Resource Assessment (\$99,000 from the Environmental License Plate Fund [ELPF]) that the Analyst believes is not essential to the department's core assessment and monitoring activities. In part, the program funds contracts to support local and regional research and outreach projects in the Sierra Nevada.

COMMENTS:

The LAO should clarify the rationale behind its recommendation to eliminate of the Sierra Nevada Initiative Resource Assessment. Specifically, the LAO should discuss the nature of "core assessment and monitoring activities" and describe the manner in which the Sierra Nevada Initiative Resource Assessment deviates from these.

ISSUE 3: COMPUTER AIDED DISPATCH SYSTEM

This proposal requests \$2.57 million (State Emergency Telephone Number Account [911 Account]) to continue funding for upgrading the Department's Computer Aided Dispatch System. In 2001-02, CDF received \$10.4 million (General Fund) for continuing development of the CAD system.

The Administration has come forth with a larger proposal relating to the 911 Account, involving an increase (0.75 percent to 1.0 percent) in the State surcharge rate. As it utilizes the 911 Account for funding, this proposal is a component of this issue being discussed by Subcommittee #4.

COMMENTS:

Until a final plan is worked-out with the 911 Surcharge discussion at the Department of General Services, the Subcommittee may wish to withhold action on this proposal.

ISSUE 4: GENERAL FUND REDUCTIONS

The Governor's 2003-04 budget proposes a \$6.72 million General Fund reduction (partially back-filled by \$5.0 in increased federal funds for fire suppression activities) to the Department's activities. These reductions include:

- **\$795,000 through the closure of two air attack bases (Porterville and Ukiah) and the relocation of the aircraft to other locations;**
- **\$750,000 through the reduction in the permanent staffing of 22 lookout towers, providing coverage only in high fire threat circumstances;**
- **\$103,000 with the suspension of out-of-state travel;**

BACKGROUND:

There have been concerns raised by the public as well as members of the Legislature relating to the closure of the two air attack bases. The Department reports that there will be no loss of service by this shifting of equipment.

COMMENTS:

The Department should discuss with the Subcommittee the logic and feasibility of the closures.

ISSUE 5: FUND SHIFT FROM GENERAL FUND TO PROPOSITION 50: CALFED

The Governor's 2003-04 budget proposes a shift of \$240,000 from General Fund to Proposition 50 for Departmental activities associated with the CALFED Bay-Delta Program.

COMMENTS:

Consistent with the Subcommittee's actions on all proposals relating to Proposition 50, these will be held over for a more detailed review on May 7, 2003.

ISSUE 6: ADDITIONAL DEPARTMENTAL PROPOSALS

The Governor's 2003-04 budget includes five additional proposals for changes to the Department's budget. Specifically, these proposals are:

- \$6.58 million (federal funds) for "pre-fire" projects to reduce hazard of wildfires.
- \$4.95 million (federal funds) to continue administration of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Program which provides technical and financial assistance to landowners.
- \$123,000 (reimbursements) for accounting activities relating to Proposition 40 expenditures.
- \$2.25 million (federal funds) to implement activities identified by the Joint Agency Climate Team as part of the California Climate Change Initiative.
- \$3.5 million (Forest Resources Improvement Fund [FRIF]) reduction to various programs due to reduced revenue to FRIF.

COMMENTS:

These proposals are consistent with the Departments activities and responsibilities. Staff has raised no issues with these.

ISSUE 7: CAPITAL OUTLAY PROPOSALS

The Governor's 2003-04 proposed budget includes eight major, and one minor capital outlay project, totaling approximately \$30 million in lease revenue bond expenditures.

These proposals are:

MAJOR AND MINOR CAPITAL OUTLAY PROPOSALS
(dollars in thousands)

Project	Project Phase	Proposal Type	Amount
Alma Helitack Base	PWC	Major	\$5,331
Batterson Fire Station	WC	Major	2,406
Baseline Conservation Camp	WC	Major	3,949
Hollister Air Attack Base	WC	Major	6,039
Blasingame Fire Station	WC	Major	1,605
Twain Harte Fire Station	PWC	Major	3,757
Lassen Lodge Fire Station	PWC	Major	4,258
Warner Springs Fire Station	PWC	Major	2,212
Chamberlain Creek Conservation Camp	C	Minor	491
TOTAL			\$30,048

P - Preliminary Plans
W - Working Drawings
C - Construction

COMMENTS:

Neither the LAO nor the committee staff have raised any issues with these proposals.

3600 - DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

The Department of Fish and Game (DFG) maintains native fish, wildlife, plant species and natural communities for their intrinsic and ecological value and their benefits to people. This includes habitat protection and maintenance in a sufficient amount and quality to ensure the survival of all species and natural communities. The department is also responsible for the diversified use of fish and wildlife including recreational, commercial, scientific and educational uses.

The Governor's proposed 2003-04 budget requests \$278.9 million for State operations, local assistance, and capital outlay expenditures.

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
(dollars in thousands)

FUND	CURRENT YEAR 2002-03	BUDGET YEAR 2003-04	CHANGE	
			AMOUNT	PERCENT
General	\$50,126	\$41,167	-\$8,959	-22%
Bond	15,093	11,395	-3698	-32%
Fish and Game Preservation Fund	94,893	91,326	-3,567	-4%
Federal	50,224	63,289	13,065	21%
Other	65,249	71,802	6,553	9%
TOTAL	\$275,585	\$278,979	\$3,394	1%
Personnel Years	2,224.1	2,173.1	-51	-2%

ISSUE 1: PUBLIC RESOURCES ACCOUNT FUNDING REDUCTION

Proposition 99, the Tobacco Tax and Health Protection Act of 1988, created the Public Resources Account as a depository for appropriations to "protect, restore, enhance or maintain fish, waterfowl, and wildlife habitat, as well as to enhance state and local park and recreation resources" on an equally funded basis.

In the Current Year, and proposed for the Budget Year, the Governor's budget provides no funding to the Department of Fish and Game from the Public Resources Account.

COMMENTS:

DFG and the Department of Finance have been asked to clarify this deletion of funding, and provide an explanation how the State can reduce this funding to DFG while still meeting the requirements of the Proposition.

ISSUE 2: FEDERAL FUNDING: GRANT PROGRAMS

The Governor's 2003-04 budget requests \$16.03 million in spending authority (\$12.02 million federal and \$4.01 million reimbursement) to implement new Federal wildlife conservation and education grant programs. Specifically, these grant programs include:

- \$4.8 million for the Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund;
- \$3.88 million for federal State Wildlife Grants;
- \$1.74 million for the Landowner Incentive Program;
- \$1.0 million for the National Coastal Wetland Conservation Grants Program; and
- \$460,000 for the Sportfish Restoration Aquatic Resource Education Program.

COMMENTS:

Staff has raised no issue with this request for expenditure authority of these federal grant programs.

ISSUE 3: OFFICE OF SPILL PREVENTION AND RESPONSE (OSPR)

The Governor's 2003-04 budget proposes \$2.86 million (Oil Spill Prevention and Administration Fund) to increase funding and implement programs at the Office of Spill Prevention and Response (OSPR) as provided for by SB 849 (Torlakson) in 2002. This proposal includes funding for 19 new positions to implement the provisions of SB 849.

BACKGROUND:

OSPR was established in 1990 to prevent and respond to oil spills affecting marine waters of the State. OSPR has taken on significant additional responsibilities through the passage of legislation in the past five years. SB 849 provided additional funding to allow OSPR to reinstate its mandated oil spill research program.

ISSUE 4: ADDITIONAL DEPARTMENTAL PROPOSALS

- **CALFED Fund Shift.** \$500,000 in reimbursement authority for the use of federal funds allowing the Department to undertake salmon, steelhead and splittail restoration efforts on the Lower American River, as part of the Department's CALFED activities.
- **Technical Assistance Reimbursement.** \$73,000 in reimbursement authority to provide technical assistance to the Santa Clara Valley Water District for compliance with endangered species requirements on fish and wildlife projects.
- **Environmental Enhancement Fund Authority.** \$897,000 (Environmental Enhancement Fund) expenditure authority for activities to enhance fish and wildlife resources in the marine environment.
- **Cantara Pollution Restoration Project.** \$560,000 (reimbursements) for restoration and monitoring activities associated with activities to mitigate effects of the 1991 Southern Pacific freight train derailment and toxic spill at the Cantara Loop Bridge over the Sacramento River.
- **Automated License Data System Position Restoration.** Restoration of 9.1 personnel years that were reduced as part of the Department's planned Automated License Data System, which has been postponed since the elimination of the positions.
- **Fish and Game Preservation Fund (FGPF) Reductions.** \$4.83 million (FGPF) in reduced programmatic expenditures to meet the reduced revenue to the FGPF.

COMMENTS:

These proposal are consistent with the Department's current activities and staff finds no issues with them at this time.

ISSUE 5: PROPOSITION 50 PROPOSALS
--

- **Proposition 50 Fund Management Activities.** \$198,000 and 1.9 personnel years for the Department's legal and accounting activities relating to fund management of Proposition 50 funds.
- **CALFED Fund Shift.** \$2.03 million shift from General Fund to Proposition 50 for Ecosystem Restoration, Integrated Storage, Science and Environmental Water Account Programs.

COMMENTS:

Consistent with the Subcommittee's actions on all proposals relating to Proposition 50, these will be held over for a more detailed review on May 7, 2003.

3640 - WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD

The Wildlife Conservation Board was established within the Department of Fish and Game (DFG) to administer a capital outlay program for wildlife conservation and related public access pursuant to the Wildlife Conservation Act of 1947. The Board conducts or oversees investigations and studies to determine the areas within the State considered most essential for wildlife production and preservation, and which will provide compatible recreational opportunities.

The Governor's 2003-04 budget proposes \$417.8 million for State operations and capital outlay expenditures.

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD (dollars in thousands)

FUND	CURRENT YEAR 2002-03	BUDGET YEAR 2003-04	CHANGE	
			AMOUNT	PERCENT
General Fund	\$21,620	\$22,057	\$437	2%
Habitat Conservation Fund	36,078	21,001	-15,078	-41.80%
Less Funding from GF for HCF	-21,301	-21,736	-435	-2%
Wildlife Restoration Fund	1,326	1,382	56	4.20%
Proposition 12	154,210	0	-154,210	-100%
Proposition 40	299,920	16,921	-282,999	-94.30%
Proposition 50	183,339	367,164	183,825	100%
Other	19,319	10,965	-8,354	43.20%
TOTAL	\$694,511	\$417,754	-\$276,757	-39.80%
Personnel Years	26.4	32.9	6.5	24%

ISSUE 1: LAO ITEM: BOND FUNDING

Propositions 40 and 50 Passed by Voters. Voters passed two large resources bond measures in 2002 allocating over \$1.2 billion in bond funds to WCB. Proposition 40—The California Clean Water, Clean Air, Safe Neighborhood Parks, and Coastal Protection Fund—was passed in March 2002 and allocates \$300 million to WCB. Proposition 50—The Water Security, Clean Drinking Water, Coastal and Beach Protection Fund of 2002—was passed in November 2002 and allocates a total of \$940 million to WCB.

Under the terms of Propositions 40 and 50, WCB is given broad authority to expend the bond funds for various purposes, including acquisition and restoration of watersheds and wetlands, agricultural and grazing land, species habitat, oak woodlands, and other habitat categories.

Of the over \$1.2 billion allocated to WCB in Propositions 40 and 50, all but \$50 million (related to Colorado River management) is continuously appropriated directly to WCB by the terms of the bond measures. This means that almost \$1.2 billion of WCB expenditures over time would be allocated outside of the budget process without legislative appropriation.

Consistent with Proposition 50, the budget proposes to allocate \$367.2 million from Proposition 50 directly to WCB for capital outlay and state operations expenditures.

COMMENTS:

LAO Recommendations. In the *Analysis of the 2003-04 Budget Bill*, the Legislative Analyst has recommended the annual appropriation of these continuously appropriated bond funds in the budget bill. Additionally, the LAO recommends the scheduling of these funds in some categorical format. The LAO should present on this issue.

Subcommittee Considerations.

1. There is some difficulty in balancing the flexibility for acquisitions given to the WCB by the voters, and the need for accountability to the Legislature that is needed to assure the State's investment in natural resources is appropriate. The LAO's proposal is quite restrictive, however there need to be some measure of increased accountability with the considerable amount of bond funds now at the WCB. Possibilities include:
 - Reporting to the JLBC prior to an acquisition of more than \$10 million;
 - Quarterly reporting to the Legislature on actions taken by the WCB and the balance of bond fund and other fund sources;
 - A more involved role for the legislative members of the advisory committee of the WCB.
2. The WCB should report to the Subcommittee, the current balances of bond funds available to the Board, and information relating to significant projects that are "seriously" in play.

ISSUE 2: PROPOSITION 50 PROPOSALS

The Governor's 2003-04 budget proposes \$36.2 million in expenditures from Proposition 50 at the Wildlife Conservation Board for the Colorado River acquisition, protection and restoration program (\$32.5 million), as well as funding for state operations costs associated with the utilization of the \$890.0 million provided to the WCB by the Bond Act (\$3.7 million).

COMMENTS:

Consistent with the Subcommittee's actions on all proposals relating to Proposition 50, these will be held over for a more detailed review on May 7, 2003.

ISSUE 3: ADDITIONAL PROPOSALS

The Wildlife Conservation Board's budget includes three additional proposals. They include:

- **Habitat Conservation Fund (HCF).** \$20.62 million (HCF) for WCB activities consistent with Proposition 117 to acquire, restore and protect plant and wildlife habitat, including deer and mountain lion.
- **Rangeland, Grazing Land, Oak Woodland Protection.** \$24.0 million in expenditures from Proposition 40 (\$4.8 for oak woodlands, and \$19.2 million for range, grazing, and grasslands) for activities consistent with Public Resources Code § 5096.650 (f) to preserve agricultural lands, grasslands, rangeland, and oak woodlands.
- **Wildlife Restoration Fund.** \$500,000 for the purposes of public access acquisition, as well as habitat restoration activities of the WCB.

COMMENTS:

These proposals are consistent with the WCB's activities and staff has raised no issues with these proposals.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS' ISSUES

The Subcommittee Chair has requested that any previously discussed items for which the Members wish to have further information, or to bring back for further discussion be addressed at this time. Staff will note these items and, in conjunction with the Legislative Analyst and relevant departments, provide a more detailed analysis for discussion at a subsequent hearing.