

# Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

---

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

---

**Collection:** Reagan, Ronald: Gubernatorial Papers,  
1966-74: Press Unit

**Folder Title:** [Environment] – Environmental Quality  
Study Council Progress Report, February 1971

**Box:** P36

---

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: [reagan.library@nara.gov](mailto:reagan.library@nara.gov)

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>



# PRESS<sup>★</sup>

State  
of  
California

## Environmental Quality Study Council

### Progress Report

February  
1971

State  
of  
California

**Environmental  
Quality  
Study  
Council**

**Progress  
Report**

February  
1971

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<u>LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL</u>	i
<u>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</u>	ii
<u>COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP</u>	iii
<u>PREFACE</u>	v
<u>SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS</u>	1
<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	2
The State's Strained Carrying Capacity	2
Air Pollution: From a Regional to a Statewide Problem	2
Population Distribution on a National Scale	3
Governmental Limitation and Fragmentation	3
The Solution: A Comprehensive Statewide Mechanism	4
Immediate Action for Metropolitan Crisis Areas	4
The Growth Ethic	5
<u>DISCUSSION OF RECOMMENDATIONS</u>	6
<u>AN ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD</u>	6
The Need for a New Approach	6
Coordination is Not Enough	6
An Environmental Management Structure	7
The Time is Now	8
The Organization	8
The Board	9
Regional Boards	9
Areas Regulated	9
Control of Other Governmental Entities	11
Citizen Involvement and Standing to Sue	11
A Board vs. Department	12
What Will Be Different under a New Structure	13
<u>NECESSARY IMMEDIATE ACTION</u>	13
An Emergency Air Quality Measure	14
Earliest Possible Relief	14
Long Term Measures	15
Basin Carrying Capacity: There is a Limit	15
Population Concentration and Public Health	16
Critical Air Basins: What Are Their Population Limits	17
<u>OTHER CRITICAL ISSUES</u>	17
State Planning	17
Coastline Protection	17
Statewide Open Space Acquisition and Preservation	17
Recreational and Second Home Developments	18
Gas Tax Diversion	18
Public Information	19

## Table of Contents (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
<u>COUNCIL ACTIVITIES</u>	20
THE COUNCIL'S SECOND YEAR	20
The Search for Long Range Solutions: Council Hearings	20
Committee Activities	20
Staff Activities	20
Recommendations for Immediate Action	21
San Diego	21
Livermore	21
Santa Rosa	22
OTHER HEARINGS	23
Millbrae	23
Los Angeles	23
Fresno and San Francisco	24
Youth and the Environment	24
FURTHER RESULTS FROM THE COUNCIL'S FIRST YEAR	24
Palm Springs	24
Inglewood	25
Palmdale	25
Malibu	26
Huntington Beach	27
MEDIA COVERAGE	28
FUTURE OBJECTIVES	28
THE COUNCIL IN RETROSPECT	29
<u>APPENDICES</u>	
A. Resolution - Emergency Air Quality Measures	A1
B. Resolution - Basin Carrying Capacity Study	B1
C. Schedule of Council and Committee Activities	C1
D. Public Hearing and Study Session Participants	D1
E. Environmental Quality Study Council - The Enabling Legislation	E1
F. Chart - State of California Activities Affecting Environmental Protection and Improvement	F1

## ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY STUDY COUNCIL

SACRAMENTO

February 1, 1971



Honorable Ronald Reagan  
Governor of California

Honorable Ed Reinecke  
Lieutenant Governor, and  
President of the Senate

Honorable James R. Mills  
President pro Tempore, and  
Members of the State Senate

Honorable Bob Moretti  
Speaker, and Members of the  
State Assembly

Gentlemen:

In compliance with Section 16055 of the Government Code, the second Progress Report of the State Environmental Quality Study Council is hereby submitted. The report covers the activities of the Council during 1970, and recommends legislative action for the 1971 Session.

The Council trusts that its efforts, in proposing governmental mechanisms for the control and enhancement of our environment and in recommending immediate steps toward solution of our more crucial problems, will prove helpful to the Governor and the Legislature.

Submitted on behalf of the members of the Council.

Respectfully

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "David L. Baker".

David L. Baker  
Chairman

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Council expresses its sincere thanks to those who have aided and supported its activities during the past year: members of the Legislature, their committees and consultants; the Lieutenant Governor and his staff, who have provided an important Council liaison to the Administration; the Environmental Policy Committee task team who assisted in the preparation of the inventory of State of California Activities Affecting Environmental Protection and Improvement (Appendix F); the environmentally involved entities of State government; and the numerous conservation and environmental groups, both quasi-governmental and public. We are also indebted to Mr. Graham O. Smith for the cover design and for technical assistance in the preparation of this report.

We again express our gratitude to those who gave of their time and efforts to participate in our public hearings, and to those who have contributed their specialized knowledge to our study sessions. (See Appendix D.) We are grateful, too, for the warm hospitality enjoyed in the cities in which we have met.

The Council especially appreciates the interest and encouragement expressed in the many letters received from California citizens, particularly those in support of the recommendations contained in this report. It is a rather poignant reflection of our times that some of these letters are from the very young, who, in another era, would have been far more absorbed in the less somber pursuits of childhood.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY STUDY COUNCIL

MEMBERS

DAVID L. BAKER, Chairman  
Supervisor, County of Orange

TOM CARRELL, State Senator  
SAMUEL A. EGIGIAN, Southern  
District Refuse Removal Council  
A. J. HAAGEN-SMIT, Ph.D., Chairman  
State Air Resources Board  
JAMES M. HALL, State Secretary  
for Business and Transportation  
ELLEN STERN HARRIS, Executive  
Secretary, Council for Planning  
and Conservation  
BRUCE J. HELD, Sandia Corporation  
NORMAN B. LIVERMORE, JR., State  
Secretary for Resources

KERRY MULLIGAN, Chairman, State  
Water Resources Control Board  
ALBERT PEARLSON, Attorney at Law  
ARTHUR F. PILLSBURY, Director,  
Water Resources Center, UCLA  
HELEN B. REYNOLDS, President,  
California Roadside Council  
EDWARD M. ROSS, Attorney at Law  
RANDOLPH E. SIPLE, Attorney at Law  
FRANK J. TYSEN, Professor  
Air Pollution Control Institute,  
School of Public Administration,  
USC

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS

LOUIS M. SAYLOR, M.D., Director,  
Department of Public Health  
JERRY FIELDER, Director,  
Department of Agriculture  
WILLIAM PENN MOTT, JR., Director,  
Department of Parks and  
Recreation  
RAY ARNETT, Director,  
Department of Fish and Game  
JAMES G. STEARNS, Director,  
Department of Conservation  
JAMES MOE, Director,  
Department of Public Works  
WILLIAM R. GIANELLI, Director,  
Department of Water Resources  
DONALD F. PINKERTON, Director,  
Department of Housing and  
Community Development

City and County Members of  
Council on Intergovernmental  
Relations

PAUL M. ANDERSON, Supervisor,  
County of Riverside  
JAMES V. FITZGERALD, Supervisor,  
County of San Mateo  
MAURICE K. HAMILTON, Councilman,  
City of San Bruno  
WESLEY MC CLURE, City Manager,  
City of San Leandro  
HOWARD H. WIEFELS, Mayor,  
City of Palm Springs

STAFF

JOHN K. GEOGHEGAN  
Executive Secretary  
ELDON E. RINEHART  
Special Consultant

COUNSEL

NICHOLAS C. YOST  
Deputy Attorney General



## COMMITTEES

### AIR QUALITY COMMITTEE

Albert Pearlson, Chairman  
A. J. Haagen-Smit, Ph.D.  
Bruce J. Held  
Edward M. Ross  
Frank J. Tysen

### LAND USE COMMITTEE

Frank J. Tysen, Chairman  
Samuel A. Egigian  
Albert Pearlson  
Helen B. Reynolds

### NOISE ABATEMENT COMMITTEE

Edward M. Ross, Chairman  
Albert Pearlson  
Frank J. Tysen

### SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Samuel A. Egigian, Chairman  
Bruce J. Held  
Albert Pearlson  
Arthur F. Pillsbury  
Edward M. Ross  
Frank J. Tysen

### WATER RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Arthur F. Pillsbury, Chairman  
Bruce J. Held  
Kerry Mulligan

### DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH ADVISORS TO COMMITTEES

John M. Heslep, Ph.D., Deputy  
Director for Environmental  
Health and Consumer Protection  
(Land Use and Solid Waste  
Management Committees)

A. E. Lowe, Senior Industrial  
Hygiene Engineer, Bureau of  
Occupational Health and  
Environmental Epidemiology  
(Noise Abatement Committee)

Henry J. Ongerth, Chief, Bureau  
of Sanitary Engineering  
(Water Resources Committee)

Lawrence B. Perry, Senior Air  
Sanitation Engineer  
(Air Quality Committee)

### SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY GROUP ON NOISE\*

Dr. Robert W. Young, Chairman  
Naval Undersea Research and  
Development Center, San Diego

Dr. David M. Green, Department  
of Psychology, University of  
California, San Diego

Jack B. C. Purcell  
Purcell-Noppe Associates  
Chatsworth

Ludwig M. Sepmeyer, Consulting  
Engineer, Los Angeles

Dr. Walter W. Soroka, Professor  
of Acoustical Sciences,  
University of California  
Berkeley

John D. Webster  
Naval Electronics Laboratory  
San Diego

Dr. George P. Wilson  
Wilson, Ihrig & Associates  
Berkeley

\*All are members of the Acoustical Society of America

## PREFACE

Before preparing this February 1971 Progress Report the Council had first to decide how it might be most effective in sustaining and improving the State's environment. Should this report deal with the many possible solutions to each facet of environmental quality, or would it be more appropriate to address the final report to these questions and instead concentrate on a small number of key measures which would deal with the most critical problems in the most comprehensive way? The Council has chosen the latter approach.

Last year the environmental effort in the State Legislature was diffused into approximately 300 measures. Although several good proposals were adopted, strong mechanisms to deal with the basic underlying questions of land use and population growth were not forthcoming. The State must be more involved in these critical issues. To do this, a strong governmental structure will be needed. We all know that effective environmental legislation entails far more than defining problems and developing technical solutions in each individual area of concern. The real question lies in implementation, not only in terms of money and manpower (although this is certainly a real problem) but also in terms of governmental mechanisms through which these problems can be dealt with in a comprehensive manner based on common goals and policies. It is to this end that the following recommendations are submitted.

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

### AN ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

The Council recommends that legislation be adopted to create an Environmental Quality Board with well-defined powers and responsibilities over water, air, solid waste, nuclear radiation, noise pollution, pesticides, and - to a limited degree - land use. It would be empowered to review and under certain conditions disallow projects of other governmental agencies having a significant impact on the environment. Such legislation should also include corresponding regional boards and strong provisions for citizen involvement through the creation of an Environmental Quality Citizens Council and by authorizing citizens' standing to sue on behalf of the environment.

### NECESSARY IMMEDIATE ACTION

#### An Emergency Air Quality Measure

The Council recommends that the Legislature, by Concurrent Resolution (Appendix A), direct the Air Resources Board to conduct intensive studies to determine means of bringing the earliest possible relief to the most critical air basins and to determine what long term continuing measures are necessary to cope effectively with existing and future air pollution levels imperiling health, which, according to the Air Resources Board, cannot be adequately alleviated by existing or presently foreseeable technical methods.

#### Basin Carrying Capacity

The Council recommends that the Legislature, by Concurrent Resolution (Appendix B), direct the Department of Public Health to conduct a study to determine, from a health standpoint, the natural carrying capacity of the San Francisco Bay Area and the South Coast Basin, and to make recommendations as to maximum permissible population concentrations for each region.

## INTRODUCTION

Last year's Council report warned in no uncertain terms of the environmental crisis facing our State. One year later we find that our environment has deteriorated further, while no adequate method is yet in sight for checking, much less reducing, this dangerous course. It has become abundantly clear that only the boldest and most imaginative measures can save the State from environmental disaster.

### THE STATE'S STRAINED CARRYING CAPACITY

The Council's concern about environmental problems has increased in proportion to its understanding. Much of what seemed bold last year now appears totally inadequate. At that time it was felt that innovative population distribution policies within the State would be an effective remedy. By encouraging or redirecting population growth to such areas as the western edge of the Sierras in the San Joaquin Valley, the Council felt that the carrying capacity of the South Coast Basin and the San Francisco Bay Area might not be strained to the breaking point. It is now painfully evident that the carrying capacity of the San Joaquin Valley itself is rapidly being exhausted.

Air pollution is undoubtedly the most recognizable index of a declining environment. In 1965, Fresno, located in the heart of the San Joaquin Valley, experienced 35 adverse days -- days in which the oxidant content exceeded a level recommended by the Air Resources Board as safe for humans. In 1969, the number of adverse days in Fresno had reached 107. Yet, this tripling in air pollution was accompanied by only a modest growth in population. One can only be greatly alarmed to note such pollution problems in a community surrounded by endless agricultural lands and vast mountain forests, and removed by hundreds of miles from any major metropolis.

### AIR POLLUTION: FROM A REGIONAL TO A STATEWIDE PROBLEM

Air pollution is fast becoming a statewide problem. Smog may be generated in San Francisco, for example, but it doesn't stay there. One major recipient is the Livermore-Amador Valley, 40 miles southeast of San Francisco, where air conditions have so begun to resemble the South Coast Basin that residents refer to the area as the "Smog Capitol of Northern California". But it doesn't settle here, either, for prevailing westerly winds carry it farther into the State. The Los Angeles-produced smog, an acknowledged contributor to the rapidly diminishing air quality of the deserts to the east, is now being blamed for the air pollution in the Antelope Valley to the north. One need not be an expert to

recognize the potential danger to the air quality of that valley, given a proposed urban population of several million.

The truth must be told. Smog now blankets much of the southern two-thirds of California during a rapidly increasing number of days. This includes many of our famous resort areas where people go "to get away from it all". During 1970, air pollution was a fact of life in Lake Tahoe, Lake Arrowhead, Laguna Beach, Malibu, Santa Barbara, Catalina Island, and even Carmel and Monterey. And, in world famous Palm Springs during this past summer and fall, the Riverside County Air Pollution Control District found that, on 60 days of the 88 monitored, the oxidants were above the level considered safe for humans, not to speak of the obvious aesthetic and economic damage to this community. Air pollution is no longer just a regional problem; it has become a definite statewide problem.

#### POPULATION DISTRIBUTION ON A NATIONAL SCALE

Under the present state of technology and our current mode of living, not only has an environmentally sound carrying capacity of our metropolitan areas been challenged, and even that of our great valleys, but the carrying capacity of the entire State is strained as well. And, of course, smog is only one index. With noise pollution, heavy traffic congestion, and inadequate land use policies, an ever growing array of environmental ills is endangering this State at an accelerating rate. Population distribution is still urgently needed, but it will no longer suffice to design such policies simply within the State. The problem is national in scale. Urban growth and population influx must be encouraged in those states where the proper balance between man and nature can still be accommodated. During World War II, contracts were distributed throughout the country to reduce vulnerability to enemy attack. Now we must employ the same tactics to protect large portions of this nation from a different kind of threat. It is obvious that California cannot handle the problem of population growth alone. This message must be taken not only to the Governor and the Legislature but also to the President's Task Force on Rural Development and his Commission on Population Growth. Meanwhile, we must make some major changes in California.

#### GOVERNMENTAL LIMITATION AND FRAGMENTATION

Our governmental mechanisms and public policies, designed basically to encourage maximum economic growth, have not served us well in protecting the environment. Local government's susceptibility to local pressures, its dependence on the property tax, and the lack of authority to deal with regional, State, and national trends and policies beyond its control are but a few of the obstacles to dealing



with environmental problems at this level. The situation is further complicated by the many special purpose districts within the State, which, in their zeal to accomplish their limited objectives, operate independently of any comprehensive local or regional policy. At the same time, State agencies are primarily oriented to their singular objectives, which also often conflict with environmental policy goals. Even the State anti-pollution agencies are too narrowly constituted to accomplish what needs to be done, while other pollution problem areas have yet to be touched by regulatory activities at the State level.

#### THE SOLUTION: A COMPREHENSIVE STATEWIDE MECHANISM

At a Council hearing in San Diego one witness, a nationally known landscape architect, attributed the State's environmental dilemma to the fact that "No one has been tending the store." As he then put it, "There has been no store." The same theme was repeated at almost every hearing. This is not to say that significant efforts have not been made in individual areas of environmental quality; but a stronger, more comprehensive approach is needed. It is time to create an appropriate State and regional mechanism with adequate powers to deal effectively with statewide pollution problems of air, water, solid waste, land use, population growth, and other environmental issues in an integrated manner. The Environmental Quality Board proposed by the Council could respond to this need.

#### IMMEDIATE ACTION FOR METROPOLITAN CRISIS AREAS

The major thrust of this report is toward the development of governmental mechanisms to deal with environmental problems at the State and regional level in the most comprehensive manner. However, the acuteness of California's environmental crisis does not allow us to stop here. There are too many critical areas throughout the State where other immediate action is needed. While smog from our metropolitan areas covers large portions of the State, conditions within these urban centers have become even more deplorable. Los Angeles experienced nine smog alerts this past summer, which had not been the case since 1956. Thus, all of the technological improvements seem to have been to little avail. Only a few years ago there were still areas left in the South Coast Basin where the air quality was better than at the core. Riverside was such an area. This is no longer the case. During a recent study session of the Council's Air Quality Committee, members were appalled to learn that last summer there was not a single day in Riverside that the peak level of oxidants was low enough to approach a safe level for humans, with the average level tripling safe limits. No wonder the Riverside County Medical Association has declared the area to be in "an almost constant state of emergency".

The Environmental Quality Board mentioned previously, were it in existence today, would be the vehicle for dealing with these immediate problems. However, they cannot wait for such a mechanism to become operational. It is to this question that two additional recommendations are addressed. The first requests that the Legislature, by concurrent resolution, direct the Air Resources Board to perform necessary studies to determine measures to bring about immediate and continuing relief to the critical air pollution problem that exists in the San Francisco Bay and South Coast Basins. The second requests the Legislature, also by concurrent resolution, to direct the Department of Public Health to perform necessary studies to determine the natural carrying capacities for these same two basins.

#### THE GROWTH ETHIC

Last year's progress report described the other pollution elements contributing to the "moribund Los Angeles region." Again this year we find conditions worsened, not only there but in the San Francisco Bay Area as well. In these critical air basins we have to change our course drastically, and do so now. We simply have to slow down our growth and stabilize the population of these areas according to their carrying capacities. This may be hard to accomplish, for growth has served us well in this country since its beginnings. But the harsh reality is that unrestrained growth and environmental quality have become incompatible in California's metropolitan regions.

During the past year there has been a growing public recognition that the growth ethic must be laid to rest. For many this is a difficult concept to accept. After all, it is not easy to suddenly reverse a set of lifetime values and attitudes. But our metropolitan regions are being progressively and irreversibly destroyed, and at such a rapid rate that only the strongest of measures will be capable of saving them. Action is the only alternative, and that action must be taken now.

## DISCUSSION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

### AN ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BOARD

#### The Need for a New Approach:

The primary issues related to the heavy toll that is being taken on the State's environment are, quite clearly, population growth and land use. Present mechanisms and policies are not suited to deal with these basic factors which underlie our most serious environmental problems. It is evident that new approaches must be instituted which can deal with these issues in the most comprehensive manner. The State is in need of an effective governmental organization not only to regulate pollution but also to preserve open space, protect critical ecological areas, and redirect, phase and, where necessary, limit growth to a level consistent with reasonable health standards and a livable environment. The inevitability and desirability of unrestrained population growth must be challenged. To attack this question, new and strong State and regional action will be necessary.

#### Coordination Is Not Enough:

If any meaningful long - or even short range - solutions to many of our resource and environmental problems are to be developed, they must reflect a broader, more comprehensive set of policies covering future land use, population distribution, and urbanization within our State. Coordination of activities is not enough. In fact under the present structure it is questionable whether, even among the best-intentioned people, coordination is even possible. There are within State government 24 departments which claim responsibility in one degree or another for more than 120 functions related to environmental quality. Although many of these efforts are highly effective, seldom are they carried out in the name of a common policy. Often these functions compete with and counteract one another. Often they set the stage for other actions, presently outside the jurisdiction of State government, which further degrade the environment.

Many departments in State government have statutory responsibility for some aspect of our natural environment. In most instances this responsibility is limited to anticipating and responding to existing trends, and does not effectively include influencing these trends. There have been a few examples of effective interdepartmental efforts, such as the Power Plant Siting Committee and the Joint Resources-Highways Committee. However, these efforts are directed to only a small fraction of the overall problem and are obviously limited in terms of matters involving competing objectives.



A properly structured State body should be able to review and reject or approve projects and activities not only in terms of their immediate environmental impact but also in relation to their broad influence on urban expansion and population growth. Certainly the State Highway and Public Utilities Commissions are not geared to properly deal with these issues nor have they been given that responsibility.

There are also inadequacies at the local and regional levels. Although legislation is put forth from time to time for strengthening and supporting local programs, no specific mechanisms have been developed for rationalizing the present myriad of jurisdictions or for reconciling the conflicting interests in environmental control at this level.

#### An Environmental Management Structure:

The point is that the problem is not litter, nor power plants, nor waste treatment and disposal - nor even the urban ghetto. The problem is the lack of a management structure which can effectively and efficiently solve today's individual problems in relation to an overall long-range plan. The fragmented approach which government at all levels has historically taken must give way to an integrated and well-managed direct attack.

The one encouraging effort in the field of environmental quality is the State-regional water resource management structure. In this the State has its first real resource and environmental management system in the form of the State Water Resources Control Board and the nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards. The Council has used this approach as the model on which to base its recommendation for the establishment of an Environmental Quality Board.

The State Air Resources Board has accomplished a great deal, considering its short life span. However, its management structure, as provided for in existing statutes, is inadequate for long term resolution of the air quality problem. One such inadequacy is the lack of clear definition of the relationship between the Air Resources Board and the local Air Pollution Control Districts -- the responsibilities for regulation of vehicular sources as opposed to stationary sources.

The State Department of Public Health is uniquely qualified to deal with environmental problems. However, historically it has been relegated to the role of academic advisor. Although the Department has produced several significant studies and recommendations on various aspects of the environment, it is virtually powerless to take any corrective action until people start getting sick, which is a little late.

During its 1970 session the State Legislature created the Office of Planning and Research. This office is charged with

preparing a comprehensive land use policy and reviewing State activities and projects for compliance with statewide environmental goals. This is a most essential effort and should be given the highest priority. However, the fact remains that there is no entity within the State government that can effectively deal with environmental problems in a comprehensive way or in a manner that can insure results at the regional level in terms of the critical question of urban growth and the resulting environmental degradation.

#### The Time Is Now:

Environmental concern has come of age, and the need for mechanisms for unified environmental control has become evident. In 1970 the Federal Government created an Environmental Protection Agency responsible for regulation of water quality, air pollution, pesticides, solid waste, and nuclear radiation. Within the last two years the states of Illinois, New York, Pennsylvania, and Washington have created unified environmental protection agencies. Maine and Oregon have created boards with wide environmental powers. Hawaii has adopted legislation permitting unified environmental responsibility. Maine and Vermont have created mechanisms for protecting land use on a statewide basis. The Council has studied each of these laws as potential models for California.

The Environmental Quality Study Council was charged with making recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature on, among other things, "governmental mechanisms .... for the coordinated protection, management, and improvement of California's physical environment." After almost two years of study, the Council can now report on this portion of its task.

We live in one environment. The various problems of pollution and of ecological damage within that environment all bear on one another. It is essential that California create a governmental mechanism enabling it to deal with environmental problems in the most comprehensive manner possible.

#### The Organization:

The Council therefore proposes creation of an Environmental Quality Board -- an organization patterned largely on the present water quality regulatory system. After considering the various State and Federal mechanisms for unified environmental control, the Council has concluded that California's own Water Resources Control Board with its Regional Water Quality Control Boards affords both a successful and a familiar model. The legislation which governs those boards, the Porter-Cologne Act, is generally recognized as creating an excellent environmental management system. For reasons of standing within State administration, the Council recommends that the Environmental Quality Board be independent of any agency and report directly to the Governor.

### The Board:

The Environmental Quality Board would consist of seven full-time and environmentally qualified persons, appointed by the Governor, who would also select the chairman from among the Board. The Board, in addition to setting statewide environmental policy, would act as an appellate body to review the decisions of the regional boards and to resolve conflicts between competing environmental values. Regional Environmental Quality Boards would operate in eight regions. There are at present nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards. This number would be reduced to eight if all that area within the South Coast Basin were in the same region. There are eleven California Air Basins. While the water and air basins are not identical, their contours are sufficiently proximate to afford a rational basis for regional environmental management.

### Regional Boards:

Each regional board would be composed of five environmentally qualified, full-time persons. Regional board members would be residents of the regions they serve. They too would be appointed by the Governor, who would also select their chairmen from among them. The Council feels that this structure is a workable one, adaptable to different regions of the State. It recognizes, however, that several options are available and have been proposed regarding the composition of regional boards and that technical expertise must be balanced with public accountability in relationship to particular regional needs. Therefore, provision should be made for each region, on its own initiative, to submit to the Legislature alternative proposals for the permanent makeup of its regional board.

### Areas Regulated:

Within the Environmental Quality Board various departments would regulate the different environmental fields. Departmental staffs would make routine decisions subject to appeal to the Board. The Board would assume regulatory responsibilities over water, air, solid waste, nuclear radiation, noise, pesticides, and to a more limited degree, land use.

Water Quality - The present system of regulation is a good one and would be transferred largely intact to the Environmental Quality Board.

Air Quality - In this field the Environmental Quality Board would absorb the functions of the State Air Resources Board and of the existing Air Pollution Control Districts. This consolidation would obviate the present dichotomy between State enforcement of vehicular emissions and local regulation of stationary sources, which has hampered effective control of air pollution.

Solid Waste - At present there is no statewide regulation in the management of solid waste. For reasons both of environmental protection and of Federal grant availability, it is desirable that the regulation of solid waste commence immediately and become part of the Environmental Quality Board when it is created.

Noise, Pesticides, and Nuclear Radiation - Regulatory programs would be included in the new organization. The Board would also pass upon the environmental aspects of power plant siting through a permit system.

Land Use - This basic element has been a common thread running through practically all of the Council's activities and emerges as the key to the future environmental quality of the State. Time and time again recommendations are made that the State must play a stronger role, using all available resources, in guiding physical development. According to the 1970 report of the Assembly Select Committee on Environmental Quality, "the demand placed on California's resources by an increasing population has resulted in the degradation of our environment. The State must play a new role in land use, urban growth, and population distribution."

Land use is an area where local interests have a deep and traditional involvement. While respecting that involvement and while also noting Presidential support for a national land use plan, the Council believes that California itself must play an active part in meeting this emerging need. The State role would involve adoption by the Environmental Quality Board of a State land use policy and a conservation and development plan, in consultation with regional boards, concerned Federal, State, and local agencies, and the public. Each regional board, working with local governments and the public, would then adopt a regional plan subject to review by the State board. Statutory direction to the State and regional boards would require different treatment of at least three categories:

1. Certain limited portions of the State are of such importance to all the people of California that a valid State interest lies in their protection. Examples would include the coastline and certain mountain and prime agricultural areas. In such cases the appropriate regional board would use a permit system for proposed development, patterned on the procedure of the successful San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission. In this regard it is recommended that the act creating the Environmental Quality Board require an interim moratorium on coastline development pending preparation and adoption of the final plans.
2. A second special category would include those portions of the State where the growth of population has exceeded

or is in danger of exceeding the resources, particularly air, which can support a healthy and decent existence. In such cases the plans would include provisions for determining the location and rate of growth by incentives and disincentives.

3. The third category is the balance of the State. In this case the Environmental Quality Board would adopt general criteria constituting a framework within which local governments would be free to control land use as presently practiced.

Those charged with planning what is environmentally desirable should be divorced from line responsibility but not totally removed from the reality of government. For this reason, the planning function should occupy a separate department within the jurisdiction of the Board and should absorb the duties of the present Office of Planning and Research.

#### Control of Other Governmental Entities:

Government itself, by its actions and its permits, in some instances degrades the environment. Single-purpose agencies as now structured tend to show more concern for the achievement of those single purposes than for their effect upon the environment. The Council therefore proposes that the Board be empowered to halt projects which are environmentally destructive and to insure compliance with the Environmental Quality Act of 1970.

The past session of the Legislature enacted the Environmental Quality Act of 1970, which provides for environmental impact reports on government actions significantly affecting the environment. The Act omitted any means of reviewing these reports and of insuring agency compliance. The Council recommends that this defect be remedied by empowering the Board to review and remand reports not in compliance with law and to bar projects which fail to comply with the Act. The Environmental Quality Act should also be improved by borrowing some of the provisions of its Federal counterpart, the National Environmental Policy Act.

#### Citizen Involvement and Standing to Sue:

Continued citizen involvement in the battle to preserve and enhance California's environment is not only desirable but necessary. For this reason the Council recommends two steps to insure such involvement: the creation of an Environmental Quality Citizens Council; and standing for citizens to sue in behalf of the environment.

The Environmental Quality Citizens Council would succeed the present Environmental Quality Council and inherit its role of



constructive environmental critic and of conduit of information and concern from citizens to government and from government to citizens. The Council would be composed of seven public members appointed by the Governor, two by the Speaker of the Assembly, and two by the Senate Rules Committee. It would report to the Governor, the Legislature, and to the Chairman of the Environmental Quality Board. The Environmental Quality Citizens Council would receive administrative support from the Board, but would retain that independence essential to its effective functioning. It would retain the present Environmental Quality Study Council's authority to hold public hearings and to make recommendations.

While administrative machinery is essential to proper environmental management, there can be no substitute for the right of each citizen to sue to preserve his environment. Such rights insure that public servants remain alert to public interest. The Council therefore proposes that the Act creating the Environmental Quality Board also include standing for citizens to sue to halt activities detrimental to their environment.

#### A Board vs. Department:

The Council's primary objective in proposing a high level environmental protection body is to bring about an effective means at the State and regional levels of planning and regulating the basic elements of environmental quality in the most comprehensive manner.

It was clear that such an organization should not include functions of a developmental nature which the entity itself would be required to evaluate and regulate. It was also clear that it must not be organized in a way that would significantly reduce the status and visibility of current efforts. The Council did not, for example, seriously consider placing this task at a departmental level. Since such a proposal would actually downgrade certain ongoing regulatory functions from board to division status, the Council concluded that this approach would have limited impact and be viewed as a step backward, when the thrust quite obviously needs to be in the opposite direction.

For any governmental entity to deal most effectively with the problems at hand, it must have sufficient stature within State government to cut across organizational lines in the comprehensive and coordinated regulation of the many competing interests and activities which have significant bearing on the future environmental quality of the State. The Environmental Quality Board proposed is the most appropriate mechanism for meeting these objectives.

### What Will Be Different under the New Structure:

The Council fully recognizes the fact that organization alone will not resolve the State's environmental problems. However, the appropriate organization and the laws that create it can serve as the foundation for the constructive planning and action so desperately needed.

The new structure would be able to plan and regulate in a comprehensive manner on the basis of what is environmentally sound. It would provide the mechanism for giving environmental matters proper standing in the decision-making process. It would provide a vehicle to guide, phase, and, if and when necessary, limit development in accordance with a State land use plan and policy. It would have the power to protect open space, the coastline, and other critical areas of regional and statewide interest. It would provide for a unified approach to management of air and water resources, solid waste, noise, pesticides, and nuclear radiation, taking into account the special environmental characteristics of a given region. It would provide citizens' standing to sue to protect the environment.

One additional advantage would result from the creation of an Environmental Quality Board as a unifying factor. It would give new visibility to that part of government directly responsible for environmental quality. Few people, even those generally well informed, can identify the State or regional bodies that regulate water quality, air quality, radiation exposure, or emissions from fossil-fueled power plants. People know of the existence of Air Pollution Control Districts, but the fact that they are county (or in one case, regional) agencies which regulate stationary sources while a State Air Resources Board regulates vehicular sources is unknown to most people. People are concerned, but they don't know who is responsible. A focus of environmental responsibility would do a great deal to dispel the public sense of helplessness and frustration. Perhaps this is what President Nixon was referring to in his recent "State of the Union" message, when he stated that there is a need to "organize around the great purposes of government" so that "when we have a problem we will know where to go -- and the department will have the authority and resources to do something about it."

### NECESSARY IMMEDIATE ACTION

The legislation recommended above, even if adopted during this year's legislative session, would require a certain amount of lead time to put into effect. Such a time lag is unacceptable to the environmental quality of certain regions and the health of many of the people who reside therein. With this in mind the Council recommends to the Legislature that certain immediate actions be taken.

### An Emergency Air Quality Measure:

The Technical Advisory Committee of the State Air Resources Board, in a report of September 1970, has recommended air quality standards, based on preservation of health, which presently are frequently exceeded in the State's most populous regions. This committee has further stated that in some instances standards which are designed to assure freedom from injury to health cannot be attained by the application of technical methods available now or in the foreseeable future.

The report states in part that:

"In some instances the standards which are designed to assure freedom from injury to health cannot be attained by the application of technical methods available now or in the foreseeable future. This incompatibility can be resolved only by drastic changes of life patterns in the most heavily populated areas. Each air basin has a limited amount of air in which to dilute its pollutant emissions; this sets a finite limit to the pollutants which can be emitted in this air basin. When this limit is approached, further production of pollutants must be stopped by whatever means are available not excluding limitation of population and economic growth within the area."

In response to this critical situation the Council recommends that the Legislature by concurrent resolution (Appendix A) direct the Air Resources Board to conduct intensive studies to determine means of bringing the earliest possible emergency relief to the most critical air basins, and to determine what long-term continuing measures are necessary to deal with air pollution imperiling health which, according to the Technical Advisory Committee of the Air Resources Board, cannot be reduced to safe levels by existing or foreseeable technical methods, and to report its findings to the Legislature by January 1, 1972.

### Earliest Possible Relief:

In studying means of bringing the earliest possible relief where this emergency condition exists, the Board should consider but not be limited to: (1) compulsory annual inspection of motor vehicles; (2) emergency regulation of the composition of fuels; (3) standardization of methods of air pollution measurement; (4) standardization of smog alert levels; (5) limitation of some or all combustion uses of fossil fuels during severe smog alert periods; (6) termination of variances for stationary sources which have been issued by local air pollution control districts; and (7) removal of the present statutory limit of \$65 per emission device for used motor vehicles.



### Long Term Measures:

In considering measures necessary to meet recommended air quality standards on a long term basis the Board should include, but not be limited to: (1) limitation of the number and use of automobiles, trucks, and aircraft in the affected area, by rationing systems, taxation, or other means; (2) reduction of emissions from these sources to levels below those now proposed; (3) rendering of all industries and fossil-fueled power plants in the affected area emission-free; (4) development of a comprehensive non-polluting urban transport system; (5) limitation of population growth in the affected area by restriction of subdivision, residential, commercial, and other urban expansion; (6) limitation of commercial and industrial growth to zero-emission facilities; (7) restriction of emissions from commercial, agricultural, domestic, and recreational sources; and (8) development of clean sources of energy.

This resolution would also ask the Board to determine implementation plans, including control measures and timetables for all, or for any combination of these and any other measures.

The first seven of this latter group of proposed measures were themselves suggested in the same report of the Technical Advisory Committee of the Air Resources Board mentioned earlier. The impact of some of these requirements staggers the imagination. They stem, according to the report, "from the concept that each basin has a limited resource of air, into which the emission of a specific maximum quantity of particulates, nitrogen oxides, carbon monoxide, and hydrocarbons can be permitted if the air quality standards are to be met, and maintained."

### Basin Carrying Capacity: There Is a Limit

Critical to the issue of environmental quality is our ability to deal with questions of urban growth and resource management at the basin level. In fact, in reviewing the State's environmental condition, it is clear that strong action will be necessary if certain regions within the State are to remain suitable for habitation.

A critical state of clear and present danger to the health and welfare of the population of the more congested metropolitan regions now exists. Federal, State, and local government actions have fostered this condition by seeking to accommodate natural population increases rather than planning and directing development in close relationship to existing environmental carrying capacity. There is a limit to the amount of growth that can be accommodated under present methods of development.

Preoccupation with growth on the urban periphery has resulted in neglect of the urban core. Migration of tax resources to new suburbs has brought a severe decline in the quality of

central city educational services. Housing stocks have been allowed to deteriorate to substandard levels. Immigration of low income population to these areas has brought radical increases in welfare costs, and increases in case loads threaten to overload and collapse the system of criminal justice. Although these subjects are not within the purview of the Council, they are a clear indication that the natural environment is not the only aspect of urban life which is suffering from our present attitudes and practices regarding growth and development.

Regional planning and regulation based on an established carrying capacity for a particular basin, with provision for the preservation of open space and natural resources and for phased rather than scattered and premature development is desperately needed. Such a charge will be of utmost priority to the proposed Regional Environmental Quality Boards. However, in the case of our most critical air basins, we are in need of immediate answers and actions.

#### Population Concentration and Public Health:

Continuing concentration of population in our most heavily urbanized regions has caused depletion of vital resources beyond the capacity of natural processes to restore them. In some instances the technical methods available now or in the foreseeable future are insufficient to restore levels of quality which will assure freedom from injury to health. So long as the technical methods remain unavailable, the natural carrying capacities of these urbanized regions must be regarded as principal criteria in the establishment of standards for the maintenance of public health.

Yet, there is presently an insufficient understanding of all factors contributing to, and interacting in, the depletion of vital natural resources and their combined impact on public health. The Council therefore recommends that the Legislature, by concurrent resolution (Appendix B), direct the Department of Public Health to conduct a study of the San Francisco Bay and the South Coast Basins to determine, from a public health standpoint, their natural carrying capacities. In conducting this study the Department should consider but not be limited to the following factors: (1) the relationship of air, water, and land pollution patterns within the regions and the regions' natural carrying capacities; (2) the relationship of population growth and natural carrying capacity; (3) the relationship of population distribution within the regions and the regions' natural carrying capacities; (4) the relationship of land use patterns within the regions and the regions' natural carrying capacities; (5) the relationship of circulation patterns within the regions and the regions' natural carrying capacities; and (6) the interrelations of any or all of these as they may affect natural carrying capacity.

### Critical Air Basins: What Are Their Population Limits?

Such a study should include proposals for adequate regulation of those factors which it has shown as threatening or exceeding the natural carrying capacities as therein determined. Further, such study should produce recommendations as to maximum permissible population figures for each region, based on the combined relationships of current factors and their impact on natural capacities. The resolution asking for this study would direct the department to report its findings and recommendations to the Legislature no later than January 1, 1972.

### OTHER CRITICAL ISSUES

Although the Council has devoted this report to governmental structure and critical basin issues, there are other measures in need of mention whose implementation will greatly improve the State's position in the fight against environmental degradation.

#### State Planning:

Strong support in terms of funds and commitment must be put behind the charge given the new State Office of Planning and Research. The legislation creating this office gives high priority to the development of a State land use policy. Because this is so critical to the future environmental quality of the State, every effort must be made by the Governor and the Legislature, whether administered through the Governor's Office or the Environmental Quality Board, to see that this important assignment is carried out.

#### Coastline Protection:

Another statewide, even nationwide, land use issue is the future of our valuable coastline. To protect it from further undesirable development a mechanism must be developed to plan and regulate the use of this important State resource. The Council will actively support legislation proposed in this regard, and further suggests that an interim moratorium be imposed during the time that a coastline plan is being formulated. The Council would strongly recommend, however, that the mechanism created be designed to be compatible with and tie into the Environmental Quality Board when established.

#### Statewide Open Space Acquisition and Preservation:

Essential to the implementation of a land use policy is a massive open space acquisition program on a statewide level. The legislation establishing such a program should be along the lines of the 1964 Bond Act and should be directed at preserving important open space areas in and near urban centers.

The Council recognizes of course that there are obvious financial limitations to the direct purchase method of preserving open space. Other measures, such as the several excellent proposals outlined in the February 1970 final report of the Joint Committee on Open Space, should be pursued.

Certainly measures that encourage urbanization should be carefully examined. The Council strongly supports, for example, assessment practices which reflect the actual rather than the highest potential use. One-time change-in-use taxes for open space lands, particularly where prime agricultural or flood plain lands are involved, should also be considered.

The Council also seriously questions the validity of the present policy of subsidizing the urbanization of flood plain lands through the use of general taxpayers funds for the construction of flood control improvements. The Council intends to report to the Legislature later in the session on the equity and long-range environmental impact of such a policy.

#### Recreational and Second Home Developments:

Another critical statewide land use issue is the proliferation of recreational and second home developments. The ultimate answer to this question is the development of a State land use policy and a mechanism to insure that it is carried out at the local level. This matter would come naturally within the responsibility of the Environmental Quality Board and its regional boards. However, action of an immediate nature which will combat the indiscriminate and premature subdividing of unpopulated lands is urgently needed. Legislation should be adopted to require cities and counties, before approving such developments, to make findings, based on appropriate studies and reports, that a particular project is environmentally sound, is in fact needed, and conforms to an approved general plan containing the open space and conservation elements mandated by the 1970 Legislature. The State should carefully monitor the procedures followed in evaluating these projects and provide technical assistance where needed.

#### Gas Tax Diversion:

Directly related to our most serious pollution problems is our current method of transportation. To save the landscape and clean the skies, the diversion of gas tax funds, by whatever means, to develop alternate modes of transportation, should once again be of the highest legislative priority. We can no longer defend the sanctity of this revenue source when it continues to expand and promote the single form of transportation that so devastates the environment.

Public Information:

Certainly no discussion of environmental problems would be complete without mention of the source of the problem -- our affluent society. Our demand upon the resources has reached an almost immeasurable level, and our capacity to generate waste is equally as staggering. We have talked about the threat of unrestrained population growth. However, continued increases in our resource demands per capita may well be a far more serious problem.

The vast majority of the public still believes that our resources are limitless and our environment indestructible. While a flip of the switch turns on the electric can opener, very few people realize that the same switch depletes our vanishing oil reserves and pollutes our air. It is time they were told the truth, for without the knowledgeable support of the public, no institution, government or otherwise, will really solve the problem.



## COUNCIL ACTIVITIES

### THE COUNCIL'S SECOND YEAR

#### The Search for Long Range Solutions; Council Hearings:

Since the first progress report was published in February 1970, the Environmental Quality Study Council has concentrated on developing long-range solutions to California's environmental ills. In working toward the development of this comprehensive plan of attack the Council has relied on ten general meetings, eight public hearings, nine committee study sessions, and extensive staff work. Recognized as a crucial determinant of environmental quality, the question of land use has dominated the Council's fact-finding activities during 1970. Hearings dealing with land use in one degree or another were held in Livermore, San Diego, Santa Rosa, Fresno, and San Francisco. Other hearings were directed at obtaining information from special groups, such as city and county governments (Millbrae), the automobile and petroleum industries (Los Angeles), and environmentally concerned youth (Sacramento).

#### Committee Activities:

The Land Use and Air Quality Committees each held several study sessions at which leaders of State and local conservation groups and environmental professionals were invited. These were held in San Francisco, Sacramento, Los Angeles, and Riverside, to enable and encourage the broadest possible participation from all areas of the State.

The Noise Abatement Committee met and worked with the Council's Scientific Advisory Group on Noise; and the Water Resources Committee had meetings with appropriate State agencies, including the Water Resources Control Board. Individual members of these committees were also very helpful in providing information for and participating in the other activities of the Council, particularly in the field of land use. A Solid Waste Management Committee was formed during the year and met with business interests, cities and counties, sanitation districts, State agencies, and various other concerned parties in seeking solutions for dealing with this important problem.

#### Staff Activities:

The Council staff consulted regularly with, and evaluated material and studies developed by, State agencies, legislative committees, environmental experts, and representatives of interested civic and professional organizations. A major effort of the staff was the completion of an inventory of State environmental control activities and their costs.

This inventory (Appendix F), which was the first such effort made at State level, provided basic information on over 120 environmental activities and responsibilities being conducted by some 24 State departments, agencies, boards, and commissions. It has been of great assistance to the Council in analyzing gaps and overlaps in the State's environmental effort, and in determining what alternate types of governmental organizations or mechanisms might be most appropriate. The staff has also reviewed various mechanisms, proposed and on-going, relating to local and regional efforts in the field of environmental quality.

The development of an appropriate governmental mechanism for the handling of environmental problems was specifically requested of the Council by its enabling legislation and is critical to any meaningful and workable approach to the development of long-range solutions. In this regard the Council was greatly assisted by the extensive data compiled by Deputy Attorney General Nicholas C. Yost, on environmental organizational efforts of other states as well as the Federal Government.

#### Recommendations for Immediate Action:

Despite its search for more basic solutions to the State's environmental quality problems, the Council did not abandon its concern for those issues in need of immediate action.

#### San Diego:

In the San Diego hearing, held February 13, 1970, the Council's interest was the preservation of open space, particularly along the coastline. A specific issue at stake, and highlighted by the Council's hearing, was the prehistoric Torrey Pines threatened by the developer's bulldozer. Other issues of Council concern included San Diego's rapidly disappearing canyons and lagoons. The Council sought to ascertain: what the obstacles are to setting aside sufficient open space in growing areas throughout the State; how those obstacles may be overcome; and what the State's role should be in this matter. The Council was pleased to note that later in the legislative session the State announced the purchase of all remaining important stands of Torrey Pines in San Diego County. This purchase was financed by State funds, matching sizeable private donations collected by concerned local citizens.

#### Livermore:

At the Livermore hearing held March 7, 1970, the Council tackled the problem of rapidly deteriorating air quality conditions in relationship to urban growth, both within the area itself as well as in adjacent areas. Livermore residents were deeply

concerned about further deterioration of their air shed by the expansion of transportation facilities in this already badly polluted valley. Another concern was the impact of intensified urbanization of the San Francisco Bay area on Livermore air quality, particularly since several adjacent counties ranked low in both standards and enforcement. A resolution passed by the Council after the Livermore hearing urged the inclusion of Napa, Solano, and Sonoma Counties in the Bay Area Air Pollution Control District, since these provide a source of some of the pollution in the Livermore-Amador Valley. This resolution was in support of legislation (AB 479), introduced by Assemblyman John Knox, which has since been signed into law. The Livermore hearing touched on some of the classic problems of urban growth. The Livermore-Amador Valley still contains a substantial amount of undeveloped land; yet it is beginning to reach air pollution levels common to the Los Angeles Basin. Thus the hearing provided a strong basis for carrying capacity studies recommended in this report.

#### Santa Rosa:

A proposed gravel dredging operation at the mouth of the Russian River at Jenner was the subject of another of the Council's hearings, in April. This dredging operation appeared likely to substantially and irrevocably alter the ecology and aesthetics of a unique river-coastal area. The Council's hearing led to the adoption of a resolution requesting that the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors, the Corps of Engineers, and other affected State and Federal agencies withhold approval of any applications for major developments at the mouth of the Russian River until such time as the then pending coastline legislation could be adopted. This resolution was followed by a wire to the Secretary of Defense, the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the members of the President's Council on Environmental Quality, requesting hearings pursuant to the Corps' regulations and the completion of the necessary environmental impact reports required by the National Environmental Policy Act.

The State Water Resources Control Board, consistent with its on-going and aggressive efforts to protect and improve water quality, has since directed the Regional Water Quality Control Board with jurisdiction in the Jenner area to withhold issuance of any discharge permit. This action is to remain in force until studies of the effects of the dredging operation on water quality and siltation are completed and hearings held on the findings. The decision of the Board left the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors little choice but to turn down the request to conduct the controversial dredging operation.

The Santa Rosa hearing also resulted in a unanimous resolution calling upon the Governor and the Legislature to create a statewide coastal commission to comprehensively plan and



protect California's fragile coastal environment and to properly guide its growth. The resolution specifically called for a commission, with regional sub-units, to be charged with supervising development until such a plan could take effect. Although coastline legislation was not adopted last year, the critical nature of this irreplaceable resource makes the creation of such a mechanism a matter of high priority in this legislative session.

#### OTHER HEARINGS:

There were several other hearings held by the Council which did not deal with issues immediately at hand but which were most useful in formulating long-range recommendations.

#### Millbrae:

The purpose of this hearing, held in May 1970, was to discuss with representatives of cities and counties environmental programs being conducted and problems being encountered at the local level. It was reported at this hearing that many local agencies had for some time been working to improve the environment in such areas as solid waste handling, city beautification, open space preservation, and sewage treatment. It was indicated, however, that their efforts are limited by lack of funds and of the authority to deal with questions of a regional nature. And, of course, there is no control at this level over the critical matters of population growth and distribution or a mechanism for insuring that statewide objectives, when and if developed, are adhered to.

Although questions arise as to the extent to which direct State involvement is necessary, it was made clear, even from the standpoint of local officials, that present policies and mechanisms are not adequate to match the task and that strong State commitments and new policies and partnerships are needed.

#### Los Angeles:

Also in May of 1970 the Council held a hearing in Los Angeles to discuss with representatives of the automobile and petroleum industries progress being made in combatting emissions from vehicular sources. The Council was surprised to learn that, although some progress is being made in terms of developing devices for the individual automobile sufficient to reduce smog levels between now and 1985, new population growth would soon offset these advances and air quality would again reach present levels.

This hearing, and the September report of the Technical Advisory Committee of the Air Resources Board, were instrumental in convincing the Council that new approaches to transportation,

land use, and population growth in relation to all other aspects of environmental quality are vitally needed.

#### Fresno and San Francisco:

Although almost every hearing held by the Council has been in some way related to the critical issue of land use, two hearings dealt specifically with this subject. The first was held in June 1970, in Fresno, on the subject of population distribution and land use capability. The second was held in San Francisco the following month, on the role of large developers and the problem of premature subdivisions. Both of these hearings clearly demonstrated the need for a State land use policy and mechanisms and procedures to insure that such a policy is carried out at the regional and local levels.

#### Youth and the Environment:

In November 1970, in Sacramento, the Council held a hearing with leaders of various student environmental organizations from college and university campuses throughout the State. Testimony and recommendations were received on such subjects as water development, land use and coastline management, air quality, solid waste, conservation education, environmental law, community involvement, nuclear power, wildlife protection, and transportation.

The Council was most impressed with the sincere interest of the students involved and the quality of their recommendations. Many of their thoughts have influenced the recommendations in this report or will be the subject of the Council's final report.

#### FURTHER RESULTS FROM THE COUNCIL'S FIRST YEAR:

##### Palm Springs:

The Council's 1969 hearings continued to produce favorable environmental results. Several developments occurred regarding the Council's Palm Springs hearing. This hearing, held at the request of the city, had been prompted by a proposal to locate two oil refineries in the San Geronio Pass, at the neck of the Coachella Valley. The Council's main concern was to ascertain how to protect a unique air basin, as yet relatively free of pollution, from a decision-making process taking place outside the principally affected area. The Clinton Oil Company, which had been planning to build one of these refineries in Beaumont, has since decided to abandon its construction plans. The other planned refinery, for nearby Banning, also appears to have been abandoned.

The most encouraging result, however, was action taken by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors to permanently protect

the County from major stationary air pollution sources. In early 1970, the Board passed an ordinance effectively banning oil refineries and power plants from the western two-thirds of the County. The Board also showed a great deal of initiative in calling together boards of supervisors from adjacent counties to establish a more effective regional approach to air pollution control. In this case the Council acted as a catalyst toward bringing about needed change.

#### Inglewood:

In September 1969 the Council's Noise Abatement Committee held a hearing in Inglewood to probe ways in which noise problems around existing airports might be abated. The hearing resulted in a Council resolution requesting the Attorney General to join the City of Inglewood in a lawsuit to reduce unnecessarily noisy operations at Los Angeles International Airport. In July 1970 the Attorney General, responding to the Council's resolution, filed a "friend-of-the-court" brief to support the City of Inglewood in its anti-noise efforts. The Council's action in this regard is particularly significant because this is the first time the State of California has become involved in a lawsuit to combat noise pollution.

#### Palmdale:

The Council's Noise Abatement Committee held a hearing in Palmdale in November 1969 on the environmental impact of the proposed Palmdale Intercontinental Airport. As a result of this hearing the Council adopted a resolution requesting that the State Department of Aeronautics rescind its previous approval of the airport and reopen the matter in order to more properly consider the environmental impact of this project. The Department rejected the Council's recommendation. Yet, testimony at the hearing indicated that neither the Department nor the Federal Aviation Agency had, in fact, considered environmental factors. In February 1970, the Noise Abatement Committee appealed by wire to both the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Transportation to draw their attention to the matter and to insure that provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act would be adhered to. This action delayed federal approval of the project until what was purported to be an environmental impact report was prepared.

The atmosphere created by the Council's actions proved beneficial in stimulating federal interest in the funding of a major planning study of the Antelope Valley. This study, which is to be coordinated by the Southern California Association of Governments, is to provide further guidelines as to how a major airport can be harmoniously integrated into an area as yet undeveloped. This "test tube" project -- the only one of its kind in the nation -- is expected to cost well over \$1-million.

There is one significant aspect of the Palmdale situation which does not appear to have been resolved. Although the Federal Government has prepared an "environmental impact report", legal opinions to the effect that the Federal Government has failed to comply with the full intent of the National Environmental Policy Act cast doubt on the legality of the federal approval of the proposed airport. The issue is presently clouded by the prospect of suits by citizens groups, aimed at invalidating the federal decision.

The Council, hoping to avert similar conflicts, sponsored SB 1108, authored by Senator Tom Carrell, a member of the Council and Chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Environmental Control. This new law requires environmental hearings prior to State approval of new airports, V/STOL, and heliports. The bill also applies to military sites being converted to civilian use. The Council also sponsored SB 1077, authored by Senator Robert Lagomarsino, which requires that the noise impact upon affected communities be a consideration of the California Highway Commission in their selections of highway and freeway routes. Council members testified before various Senate and Assembly committees on behalf of these bills.

#### Malibu:

The Malibu hearing led to several exciting and significant actions by State government. This two-day hearing, which was held in December 1969, considered the environmental problems of areas located in the path of expanding urban centers. It became quite clear that this valuable and unique open space resource, still available to the citizens of the Los Angeles metropolitan region, might soon be absorbed by urban sprawl. Therefore the Council adopted a resolution recommending that an early in-depth environmental study of the area be conducted and that meanwhile the planning and construction of freeways and other public works facilities be held in abeyance.

The hearing created much public awareness of the problems facing this unique area and helped to mobilize community sentiment and support for the introduction and adoption of legislation to eliminate the Malibu-Whitnall Freeway from the State highway system (SB 801, Senator Lou Cusanovich). In signing the bill, the Governor pointed out that it is a policy of his Administration "not to allow public works to damage scenic beauty or the natural environment of California." He further stated that "by removing this freeway route from our system we will preserve the delicate ecology of a beautiful gorge and mountain area that contains the only year-round natural stream in Los Angeles County."

In order to prevent thoughtless piecemeal destruction of the entire Santa Monica Mountain area, Legislation was introduced

(SB 959, Senator Robert Stevens) and adopted to create the Ventura-Los Angeles Coastal and Mountain Study Commission. The commission is charged with conducting a comprehensive investigation of the regional significance of the Santa Monica Mountain area, to evaluate the threat that development would bring about, and to propose policies to best preserve the area's ecological character. The commission bill included a two-year moratorium on State projects of over \$5-million. The Division of Highways had already responded to this measure by taking administrative action to halt all further planning of the proposed coast highway. The regional significance of the Santa Monica Mountains is rapidly being recognized at all levels of government, as indicated by the introduction last fall of federal legislation to establish an Urban National Park in these mountains.

#### Huntington Beach:

The Council also came out strongly against additional fossil-fueled power plants in the South Coast Basin. After holding a hearing in Huntington Beach on a proposal by Southern California Edison Company to expand its generating plant, the Council recommended that a moratorium be placed on the construction of fossil-fueled power plants in the South Coast Basin unless it could be demonstrated that further deterioration of the quality of air in the basin would not result.

The Council's action prompted the Orange County Board of Supervisors to deny the permit of Southern California Edison Company and call for a moratorium on construction of all fossil-fueled plants throughout the State. Shortly thereafter, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors passed Rule 67, aimed directly at limiting the amount of pollution to be emitted from power plants. This action was followed by the adoption of similar legislation by the Orange County Board of Supervisors. Again the Council was able to act as a catalyst to bring about needed changes.

The issue in this case was power needs versus environmental quality. It was the position of the power industry that power is needed and that expansion of the Huntington Beach Plant and continuing use of fossil fuels is the only way to meet this need. The Council felt that the issue had to be faced squarely and through strong action. The elimination of fossil-fueled power plants is the Number One objective of many air pollution authorities. If the latest auto emission standards are effective, and if future power needs are to be met by the use of fossil fuels, power plants would surpass automobiles as the major source of air pollution in the South Coast Basin within a very short period of time.

This emerging problem led Dr. Arie Haagen-Smit to report recently to the Air Resources Board, of which he is chairman, that "no



more fossil power plants producing oxides of nitrogen can be tolerated in the South Coast Basin." The Council so effectively brought attention to the problem that plans of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power to expand their Scattergood plant in Playa del Rey were also halted.

The issue insofar as Southern California Edison is concerned has not yet been resolved. The Public Utilities Commission has since overruled the Orange County Board of Supervisors, and the matter is now awaiting review by the State Supreme Court. Such legal complications did not arise in the case of the Scattergood plant, since facilities of the Department of Water and Power do not come within the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission. Issues such as these exemplify the need for a single multi-disciplined State entity to deal with environmental degradation. Special purpose departments, commissions, and agencies often have difficulty in this regard since, in most cases, they are assigned the responsibility of meeting a special need.

#### **MEDIA COVERAGE:**

An important by-product of the above mentioned hearings was the several in-depth newspaper articles which provided a useful tool in informing the public not only on specific issues but also on their broader implications. One article, which was prompted by the San Diego hearing, examined the fragile ecology of the California coast and stressed the importance of preserving lagoons to perpetuate a healthy marine life on the coast. Another, which appeared after the Livermore hearing, probed the growing smog crisis throughout California and adjacent states, alerting people to the fact that this problem is no longer limited to metropolitan areas. A third article, which followed the San Francisco hearing, dealt with problems created by the so-called recreational or second home developments. This topic has since occupied the attention of various State legislators, who have probed the problem in interim hearings, which could result in corrective legislation being achieved this year.

Other in-depth newspaper articles published this year as a result of the Council's hearings dealt with Malibu and the Antelope Valley. The Palmdale issue rated several quite excellent stories, including a fine investigative piece on the application of the National Environmental Policy Act to this project. The Council owes considerable debt to the cooperation of the news media throughout the State in covering the Council's activities and in creating public understanding of environmental problems.

#### **FUTURE OBJECTIVES:**

Although the Council has put forth a number of recommendations and has attempted to bring about positive actions to protect the environment, its overall objective has not been accomplished.

During its final year, the Council will concentrate on the development of comprehensive statewide goals and objectives as well as specific guidelines, policies, and standards in all areas of environmental quality. The Council will strive for the expansion and refinement of the basic governmental mechanism proposed in this report and examine and make recommendations concerning those public and private policies and actions which have the greatest impact on the environment. Questions of land use, urban expansion, and population growth and distribution, and the policies, practices, causes, and consequences related to these major environmental issues will continue to receive primary attention.

The Council will not only make recommendations concerning the broad policy considerations mentioned above but will also propose corrective measures in each specific area of environmental quality. Significant emphasis will be placed on those tax, assessment, and other economic practices which affect environmental quality. Another important issue which will receive considerable Council attention is that of environmental funding. Stated simply, although the assignment is extremely complex, the objectives of the Council's final year will be to conduct those activities which are necessary to develop for the Governor and the Legislature a comprehensive plan to resolve the State's environmental problems on a long-range basis.

#### THE COUNCIL IN RETROSPECT

Some of the important aspects of the activities and accomplishments cited here point to the Council's role as a catalyst in bringing about needed change through mobilization of community interest and action. Another positive role attributed to the Council is in getting private interests and public agencies to reevaluate certain decisions involving environmental quality. Although it has been criticized for actions taken on specific issues, changing attitudes have tended to support the Council's concern about the particular proposals involved. Noise and airport development are now recognized as critical environmental issues; freeways adversely affecting the environment are being taken out of the State system; the use of fossil fuel as a source of power in congested and highly developed air basins is now recognized as unacceptable; and the State itself is taking a new look at the Russian River dredging proposal.

There is also the feeling that the Council is somewhat separate from the traditional State bureaucracy and therefore more accessible to those who might otherwise meet with total frustration in trying to tackle specific environmental issues.

To the general public and to conservation groups, it provides a forum for discussion at the State level.

This concept is echoed by groups such as "Stamp out Smog", in Orange County. In its recent newsletter on the Council's Air Quality Committee study session at the University of California, Riverside, they state: "The State Environmental Quality Study Council met and again gave the various citizens groups additional evidence of the fact that they will listen, and that they are willing to carry worthwhile messages from the citizenry to the government." This view was further expressed in a statement from Clean Air News, published in Riverside, ".... in the State's Environmental Quality Study Council .... citizens of California have found a communications channel to the State government." Not only is this process an outlet for private individuals and organizations, but it can be utilized by local government as well. In addition to the Palm Springs request which has already been cited, a letter was recently received from the Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors extending "an invitation to meet here so that some very important environmental issues can be discussed by the Council and the people of this County."

Some of the Council's roles are confirmed by an article prepared by UCLA Professor James Krier for the Stanford Law Review. The article elaborates on the fractionated system of government in which citizens are all too often powerless. It sees the Council as filling an important void in our present system, both as an ombudsman and as an environmental advocate.

The Council, therefore, has numerous roles. One is to develop comprehensive answers and long-range solutions to the environmental problems of the State. Another includes acting as a sounding board for the discussion of environmental issues and bringing attention to these problems and increasing the understanding of all parties concerned about possible solutions. It stands today as a viable advisory group with a broad balance of representation including State legislators and administrators, local government, and the public at large, able to respond to specific problems in need of immediate solutions as well as to advise on a long-range basis.



---

APPENDIX A

A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING AN  
EMERGENCY AIR QUALITY MEASURE

---

## APPENDIX A

### A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE AIR RESOURCES BOARD TO CONDUCT STUDIES RELATING TO AIR QUALITY IN CRITICAL AIR BASINS

WHEREAS, The Technical Advisory Committee of the California Air Resources Board has recommended air quality standards based on preservation of health which presently are frequently exceeded in the State's two most populous regions; and

WHEREAS, Responsible physicians and official medical associations have described this as a state of emergency; and

WHEREAS, The Technical Advisory Committee of the California Air Resources Board has further stated that in some instances standards which are designed to assure freedom from injury to health cannot be attained by the application of technical methods available now or in the foreseeable future; and

WHEREAS, No implementation plan, including control measures and a timetable, for the attainment of the recommended air quality standards based on preservation of health presently exists; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, That the Members hereby request the California Air Resources Board to conduct a study of all means of bringing the earliest possible relief where this state of emergency exists, including, but not limited to:

1. Compulsory annual inspection of motor vehicles;
2. Emergency regulation of the composition of fuels;
3. Standardization of smog alert levels;
4. Standardization of methods of air pollution measurement;
5. Limitation of some or all combustion uses of fossil fuels during severe smog alert periods;
6. Termination of variances for stationary sources which have been issued by local air pollution control districts;
7. Removal of the present statutory limit of \$65 per emission device for motor vehicles;

and to determine implementation plans for all, or for any combination of these and any other measure; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Members hereby request the California Air Resources Board to conduct a study of all measures necessary

## Appendix A

to achieve the recommended air quality standards based on preservation of health in the long-term, including, but not limited to:

1. Limitation of the number and use of automobiles, trucks, and aircraft in the affected area, by rationing systems, taxation, or other means;
2. Reduction of emissions from these sources to levels below those now proposed;
3. Rendering of all industries and fossil-fueled power plants in the affected area emission-free;
4. Development of a comprehensive non-polluting urban transport system;
5. Limitation of population growth in the affected area by restriction of subdivision, residential, commercial, and other urban expansion;
6. Limitation of commercial and industrial growth to zero-emission facilities;
7. Restriction of emissions from agricultural, domestic, and recreational sources;
8. Development of clean sources of energy;

and to determine implementation plans, including control measures and timetables for all, or for any other measures; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the California Air Resources Board shall submit a report of its findings from both studies, and of its proposed implementation plans and timetables, to the Legislature no later than January 1, 1972.

---

---

APPENDIX B

A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING A  
BASIN CARRYING CAPACITY STUDY

---

---

## APPENDIX B

### A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH TO DETERMINE, FROM A HEALTH STANDPOINT, THE NATURAL CARRYING CAPACITIES OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AND SOUTH COAST AIR BASINS

WHEREAS, Continuing concentration of population in the most heavily urbanized regions of the State, and increasing production, consumption, and waste generation rates have, on occasion, combined to deplete and cause deterioration of vital resources beyond the capacity of natural processes to restore them; and

WHEREAS, In some instances the technical methods available now or in the foreseeable future are insufficient to restore levels of quality which will assure freedom from injury to health; and

WHEREAS, So long as such technical methods remain unavailable, the natural carrying capacities of these urbanized regions must be regarded as principal criteria in the establishment of standards for the maintenance of public health in the face of continued urbanization and concomitant increases in waste generation; and

WHEREAS, There is presently an insufficient understanding of all factors contributing to, and interacting in, the depletion of vital natural resources and their combined impact on public health; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  
That the Members hereby request the California State Department of Public Health to conduct a study of all such major factors and their impact on the natural carrying capacities of the State's two most urbanized regions, the nine-county San Francisco Bay and the South Coast Air Basin, to include, but not be limited to:

1. The relationship of air, water, and land pollution patterns within the regions and the regions' natural carrying capacities;
2. The relationship of population growth and natural carrying capacity;
3. The relationship of population distribution within the regions and the regions' natural carrying capacities;
4. The relationship of land use patterns within the regions and the regions' natural carrying capacities;
5. The relationship of circulation patterns within the regions and the regions' natural carrying capacities;
6. The interrelations of any or all of these as they may affect natural carrying capacity;



## Appendix B

and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the study shall include proposals for adequate regulation of those factors which it has revealed to threaten or to exceed the natural carrying capacities as therein determined, and further that these proposals will include maximum permissible population figures for each region, based on the combined relationships of current factors and their impact on natural carrying capacities; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the Director shall appoint an Advisory Committee representing appropriate professions and skills, expressly to aid the State Department of Public Health in the planning and conduct of the study, and that this Advisory Committee shall hold regular public hearings in the course of its duties; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the State Department of Public Health shall submit a report of its findings from the study, and of its proposals, to the Legislature no later than January 1, 1972.

---

APPENDIX C

SCHEDULE OF COUNCIL AND COMMITTEE  
ACTIVITIES, 1970

---

APPENDIX C

SCHEDULE OF  
COUNCIL AND COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES, 1970

<u>Date</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Location</u>
January 5	Special EQSC Meeting, to consider Progress Report	Sacramento
January 22	Tenth Regular EQSC Meeting	Sacramento
February 4	Eleventh Regular EQSC Meeting	Sacramento
February 13	Public Hearing, Problems of Conservation of Land- and Water-Related Open Space Areas	San Diego
February 16	Study Session, Water Resources Committee, with representatives of Department of Public Health and Water Resources Control Board	Berkeley
March 7	Public Hearing, Threat of Air and Water Pollution and Diminishing Open Space from Major Urban Centers to Adjacent Areas	Livermore
March 19	Twelfth Regular EQSC Meeting	Sacramento
April 15	Thirteenth Regular EQSC Meeting	Santa Rosa
April 16	Public Hearing, Coastline Development	Santa Rosa
May 6	Fourteenth Regular EQSC Meeting	San Francisco
May 7	Public Hearing, Role of Local Government Officials in Environmental Quality Control	Millbrae
May 21	Public Hearing, Air Quality and the Automobile and Petroleum Industries	Los Angeles
June 5	Study Session, Water Resources Committee with representatives of Water Resources Control Board	Sacramento
June 17	Fifteenth Regular EQSC Meeting	Fresno
June 18	Public Hearing, Population Distribution and Land Use Capability	Fresno
July 16	Study Session, Land Use Committee, with Planning and Design representatives from government and the private sector	Sacramento

Schedule of Council and Committee Activities, 1970

<u>Date</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Location</u>
July 29	Sixteenth Regular EQSC Meeting	San Francisco
July 30	Public Hearing, Large-Scale Land Development	San Francisco
September 10	Seventeenth Regular EQSC Meeting, and Tour of San Onofre Nuclear Power Plant	San Clemente
September 15	Study Session, Solid Waste Management Committee, with representatives of industry, and State, County, and City governmental agencies	Sacramento
September 24	Study Session, Air Quality Committee, with Air Resources Board and representatives of citizens' organizations	Sacramento
October 15	Eighteenth Regular EQSC Meeting	Sacramento
October 29	Study Session, Noise Abatement Committee with Scientific Advisory Group on Noise	Inglewood
November 9	Study Session, Land Use Committee, with representatives from citizens' groups	San Francisco
November 13	Study Session, Land Use Committee, with representatives from citizens' groups	Los Angeles
November 17	Study Session, Solid Waste Management Committee, with representatives from industry and State officials	Sacramento
November 20	Public Hearing, Youth and the Environment	Sacramento
November 24	Study Session, Air Quality Committee, with Statewide Air Pollution Research Center, University of California, and representatives from citizens' groups	Riverside
December 17	Nineteenth Regular EQSC Meeting	Sacramento
December 29	Meeting, Air Quality Committee, to discuss alternate air quality recommendations for 1971 Progress Report	Beverly Hills

---

APPENDIX D

PUBLIC HEARING AND STUDY SESSION  
PARTICIPANTS

---



APPENDIX D

PUBLIC HEARINGS

LAND AND WATER RELATED OPEN SPACE

Date: February 13, 1970  
Place: La Jolla (San Diego)

Participants

Mayor Frank Curran, San Diego  
John S. Bradshaw, President, Torrey  
Pines Wildlife Association  
Ed Butler, Attorney at Law  
Prof. Tony Corso, San Diego State  
College  
Mrs. John Gruba  
John P. Kelly, Kensington Improve-  
ment Association  
Floyd Ruocco, Architect  
Francis Dean, Architect  
Philip R. Pryde, Sierra Club  
Mrs. Virginia W. Taylor, Republican  
State Central Environmental Quality  
Standing Committee  
Mrs. Frances Marshall, Crown Garden  
Club  
Mrs. Susan Chaney  
Richard Pryterch  
John Nagy  
Mrs. Marston Sargent  
Gordon Soderland  
Mrs. Philip Farman  
Mrs. Arthur Morley  
Mrs. Jane Edmiston  
Supervisor Jack Walsh, San Diego  
County  
Councilman Bob Martinet, San Diego  
Councilman Mike Schaeffer, San Diego  
Councilman Lloyd Morrow, San Diego  
Homer Delawie, Planning Commissioner,  
City of San Diego  
Councilman Ben Cohan, Coronado  
Harold Gorham (re monorail system)  
John F. Crane  
August A. Pfeiffer, Kensington  
Improvement Association  
Arthur Jobla  
Mrs. Ruby Zellman  
Henry P. Cramer  
James Clapp, Urban Planning, San  
Diego State College  
Frank Aubrey, Zero Population Growth  
Gerald Fox, Environmental Education  
Clearinghouse.

ENVIRONMENTAL THREATS FROM MAJOR  
URBAN CENTERS TO ADJACENT AREAS

Date: March 7, 1970  
Place: Livermore

Participants

Mayor Bernie Gerton, Pleasanton  
Mayor Gilbert Marguth, Livermore  
Gordon Bell, Meteorologist, State  
Air Resources Board  
Dr. Todd Crawford, Valley Air  
Pollution Committee  
Milton Feldstein, Bay Area Air  
Pollution Control District  
Dr. Rodney Beard, Stanford Medical  
Center; Technical Advisory Com-  
mittee, Air Resources Board  
Dr. Ray Thompson, State Air Pollution  
Research Center, UC, Riverside  
George Musso, Planning Director,  
Livermore  
Robert Seiker, State Division of  
Highways  
Larry Dahms, Bay Area Rapid Transit  
Roy Renner, Consultant, California  
Steam Bus Project  
Erwin Luckman, People for Open Space  
William Fraley, Planning Director,  
Alameda County  
Herbert Crowle, Director of Public  
Works, Alameda County  
Hulet C. Hornbeck, East Bay Regional  
Park District  
Councilman Donald Miller, Livermore  
Arthur Futch, Planning Commissioner,  
Livermore  
Michael MacCracken, Chairman, Del  
Valle Committee  
Dr. Don Watson, Chairman, Clean Air  
Coordinating Council  
Peter Zars, Sierra Club  
Dr. Clarence L. Hoenig  
Edward Royce, Sierra Club  
Kent Dedrick, Southern Crossing  
Action Team  
Robert Pearson, Citizens for Planned  
Progress  
Mrs. Valerie Raymond, League of  
Women Voters  
Stewart Smith, Clean Air Coordinating  
Council

## PUBLIC HEARINGS

### SHORELINE MODIFICATION AND MANAGEMENT

Date: April 16, 1970

Place: Santa Rosa

#### Participants

Robert Theiller, Chairman, Sonoma  
County Board of Supervisors  
Honorable John Dunlap, Assemblyman,  
Fifth District  
John Tutuer, Sierra Club  
George Kovatch, Planning Director,  
Sonoma County  
Dr. David Joseph, Executive Officer,  
North Coastal Regional Water  
Quality Control Board  
D. J. Everitts, State Lands Commission  
Bradford W. Lundborg, Sonoma County  
Organization for Planned Environment  
(SCOPE)  
Colonel Charles Roberts, U. S. Army  
Corps of Engineers  
Karl Treffinger, American Institute  
of Architects  
Prof. Joseph Johnson, UC, Berkeley;  
Consultant, Northern California  
Aggregates  
John Zierold, Planning and Conser-  
vation League  
Philip Arend, Consulting Ecologist to  
Northern California Aggregates  
Dr. Cadet Hand, Marine Biologist,  
UC, Berkeley  
Dr. Ted O'Brien, Jenner Coastside  
Conservation Coalition  
Dr. Edward Smith, Pacific Marine  
Station  
Dr. Joseph Brumbaugh, Sonoma State  
College  
Paul Covell, Audubon Society  
Harold D. Bissell, State Interagency  
Council on Ocean Resources  
Jack Dolan, California Advisory  
Commission on Marine and Coastal  
Resources  
Gordon Miller, Director of Public  
Works, Sonoma County  
Jonathan Ela, Sierra Club  
Stephen Johnson, Sierra Club  
Georg Treichel, Center of Ecological-  
Environmental Studies, San Francisco  
State College

William Kortum, President,  
Californians Organized to Acquire  
Access to Tidelands (COAST)  
Claude Minard, Sonoma State College  
Clarence Bob Stein  
V. M. Moir, California Chamber  
of Commerce

### ROLE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL

Date: May 7, 1970

Place: Millbrae

#### Participants

Mayor William G. Glang, Millbrae  
Jack Walsh, Supervisor, San Diego  
County  
Lyman Cozad, City Manager, Arcadia  
Henry J. Mello, Supervisor, Santa  
Cruz County  
Harry A. Tow, City Manager, Visalia  
James V. Fitzgerald, Supervisor,  
San Mateo County  
Jack Merelman, General Counsel and  
Manager, County Supervisors  
Association of California  
Mrs. Mary W. Henderson, Councilman,  
Redwood City; representing  
Association of Bay Area  
Governments (ABAG)  
Mrs. Claire Dedrick, Conservation  
Coordinators  
Mrs. Pat Barrentine, Committee for  
Green Foothills  
Case Hansen, San Diego County  
Mrs. Hazel Bond, Bay Area  
Association of University Women

## PUBLIC HEARINGS

### AIR QUALITY AND THE AUTOMOBILE AND PETROLEUM INDUSTRIES

Date: May 21, 1970

Place: Los Angeles

#### Participants

John A. Maga, Executive Officer,  
State Air Resources Board  
Robert L. Chass, Los Angeles  
County Air Pollution Control  
District  
Donald A. Jensen, Automobile  
Emission Office, Ford Motor  
Company, Dearborn, Michigan  
Joe E. Stoyack, Manager, Chrysler  
Corporation Exhaust Control  
Laboratory, Los Angeles  
Howard Hesselberg, Coordinator  
of Air Conservation, Ethyl  
Corporation, Ferndale, Michigan  
R. E. Jeffrey, Manager, Research  
and Development, Shell Oil  
Company, Detroit, Michigan  
James Dooley, Vice President,  
Advance Development, McCulloch  
Corporation, Los Angeles  
Malcolm McDuffie, President,  
Mohawk Petroleum Corporation, Inc.,  
Los Angeles  
E. E. Spitler, Manager, Fuels  
Division, Chevron Research  
Company, Richmond, California  
M. S. Thompson, Administrative Vice  
President, Union Oil Company of  
California  
D. Allan Sedgwick, Vice President,  
West Coast Operations, Texaco,  
Inc., Los Angeles  
Mrs. Margie Levi, Stamp Out Smog  
Mrs. Pauline Koch, People's  
Action Research  
William Greninger, Sierra Club  
Ed Koupal, General Manager,  
People's Lobby  
Mrs. Cassells, Playa del Rey

### POPULATION DISTRIBUTION AND LAND USE CAPABILITY

Date: June 18, 1970

Place: Fresno

#### Participants

W. Stuart Home, Fresno Community  
Council  
R. W. Bergstrom, Director,  
Environmental Health, Fresno  
County Health Department  
Donald Livingston, Planning  
Director, Fresno County  
Professor Harold Tokmakian,  
Urban and Regional Planning,  
Fresno State College  
John R. Teerink, Deputy Director,  
State Department of Water  
Resources  
Colonel George B. Fink, District  
Engineer, U. S. Army Corps of  
Engineers  
Zane G. Smith, Jr., Sierra  
National Forest Service  
John Rutherford, Zero Population  
Growth  
Michael McCloskey, Executive  
Director, Sierra Club  
L. R. Wohletz, Soil Conservation  
Service, U. S. Department of  
Agriculture, Berkeley  
Don Dressler, Legislative  
Assistant, California Farm  
Bureau Federation  
Professor Henry Fagin, School of  
Administration, University of  
California, Irvine  
Larry Kiml, California Chamber  
of Commerce

## PUBLIC HEARINGS

### LARGE-SCALE LAND DEVELOPMENT

Date: July 30, 1970

Place: San Francisco

#### Participants

Keith Whipple, representing  
citizens group, Etna,  
Siskiyou County  
Richard S. Whitehead, Planning  
Consultant, Santa Barbara  
The Reverend Richard Sample,  
Center for Environmental  
Action, San Francisco  
Mrs. Betsy H. Laties, Friends  
of the Santa Monica Mountain  
Parks  
Stephen Moses, General Manager,  
Boise-Cascade Recreational  
Communities, Palo Alto  
Harold A. Berliner, District  
Attorney, Nevada County  
Jerome B. Gilbert, Executive  
Officer, State Water Resources  
Control Board  
Ryland Kelley, President,  
Hare, Brewer and Kelley, Inc.,  
Palo Alto  
Sam Whiting, Attorney at Law,  
Western Property Developers  
Council  
Thomas J. Nolan, Assistant  
Commissioner, Subdivisions,  
State Department of Real Estate  
Donald A. Woolfe, Planning  
Director, Tulare County  
Lee Syracuse, Planner, California  
Builders Council  
Ben Glading, Regional Manager,  
Region II, State Department of  
Fish and Game  
Mrs. Claire Dedrick, Conservation  
Coordinators, Menlo Park

### YOUTH AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Date: November 20, 1970

Place: Sacramento

#### Participants

Gerald Meral, University of  
California, Berkeley (Water  
Development)  
Lance King, University of  
California, Santa Cruz  
(Coastline)  
Miss Claudia Ayers, University  
of California, Berkeley  
(Air Quality)  
Paul Silver, University of  
California, Los Angeles  
(Waste Management)  
Robert Von Holdt, Hayward State  
College (Waste Management)  
Clifford Humphrey, Ecology  
Action, Modesto (Land Use)  
James Eaton, University of  
California, Davis (Land Use)  
Fred de Jarlais, San Francisco  
State College (Land Use)  
Carl Newman, San Fernando Valley  
State College (Community  
Involvement in Environmental  
Conservation)  
David Jackman, Stanford Law  
School (Role of Environmental  
Law Societies)  
Miss Ora Citron, University of  
Southern California (Environ-  
mental Education)  
Robert Burgess, University of  
California, Los Angeles  
(Transportation)  
Gregg Schluntz, Hayward State  
College (Nuclear Power)  
Dennis Clark, Sacramento State  
College; and  
Jack Wilburn, Sacramento State  
College (Plant and Wildlife)  
Miss Wendy Groner, San Francisco  
State College  
Donald Mitchell, Stanford University  
Jack Anders and Christine Swan,  
high school students, Sacramento

COMMITTEE STUDY SESSION  
PARTICIPANTS

AIR QUALITY COMMITTEE

September 24, 1970 - Sacramento

Peter Bouvier, Planning and  
Conservation League  
Paul Clifton, Resources Agency  
William Greninger, Chairman,  
Statewide Coalition for Clean  
Air  
John A. Maga, Executive Officer,  
Air Resources Board  
Lawrence B. Perry, Department  
of Public Health  
Larry Ruff, Clean Air Council  
of San Diego  
Roger Sperling, Project Clean  
Air  
Peter Zars, Coalition for Clean  
Air; Sierra Club

November 24, 1970 - Riverside

Clean Air Now

Donald Bauer, Chairman  
Donald E. Zimmer

Statewide Air Pollution Research  
Center, University of California  
at Riverside

Dr. Joseph V. Behar  
Dr. Paul Miller  
Dr. Peter J. Slota, Jr.  
Dr. Edgar L. Stephens  
Dr. C. Ray Thompson

Coalition for Clean Air

Bill Greninger, Chairman  
Ray Bogucki

Clean Air Council

Dr. Alan Schneider

Sierra Club

John Zierold  
Nathaniel Van de Verg

Stamp Out Smog

Mrs. Pauline W. Koch  
Mrs. Jear Somers  
James Somers

American Medical Association

Gerschen L. Schaefer, M.D.

Citizens for Clean Air

Wallace J. Duffy

Write for Your Life

Mrs. Eda Rossman

Save Our Children

Mrs. Toni Sample

Fieldtec, Inc.

Robert W. Scholler  
UCLA - Dr. Richard Perrine  
Pollution Research and Control  
Corporation - Erwin Kauper  
Women For: - Mrs. Livia Donovan  
Planning and Conservation  
League - Martin M. Leveedale  
U. S. Forestry Service  
Clyde A. O'Dell  
Morris W. McCutchen  
Quanti Folley, San Bernardino  
Sun-Telegram  
Bill Lair, KPRO Radio

LAND USE COMMITTEE

July 16, 1970 - Sacramento

Samuel Cullers, Assistant Chief,  
State Office of Planning  
Robert Goodier, Division of Soil  
Conservation  
James D. Stokes, Department of  
Fish and Game  
Edward Williams, Eckbo, Dean,  
Austin and Williams, Architects  
John C. Williamson, Legislative  
Joint Committee on Open Space  
Samuel E. Wood, Consultant

November 9, 1970 - San Francisco

Honorable Jean Fassler,  
Supervisor, San Mateo County  
Mrs. Claire Dedrick, Peninsula  
Conservation Center  
Frank M. Stead, Planning and  
Research Associates  
Eric Carruthers, President,  
California Coastal Planners  
Mrs. Celia von der Muhll,  
President, Save the Coast  
Mrs. Barbara Milhous and  
Ted Milhous, Jenner Coalition  
Alfred Heller, President,  
California Tomorrow  
Frederick Styles, Assembly Science  
and Technology Advisory Council  
Dr. Robert Girard, Stanford Law  
School  
Edward Royce, Sierra Club



## Committee Study Session Participants

### LAND USE COMMITTEE (continued)

Georg Treichel, Member, Governor's Coastal Commission  
Gail Achterman, Save San Francisco Bay Association  
Mrs. Janet Gray Hayes, Save Our Valley Action Committee  
William D. Evers, Open Space Action Planning; Conservation League  
Mrs. Dorothy Erskine, People for Open Space  
Dr. Kenneth Hayes, Santa Clara County Medical Society, Environmental Health Committee  
Leslie E. Carbert, Associated Regional Citizens  
Harold A. Berliner, District Attorney, County of Nevada  
Thomas Bonnicksen, Commissioner, State Department of Parks and Recreation  
Wayne M. Swan, American Institute of Planners  
Daniel Kane, Jr., Committee for Green Foothills  
Graham O. Smith, Save Malibu Canyon Committee  
William E. Spangle, Sr., Committee for Green Foothills  
John M. Haley, State Department of Water Resources

November 13, 1970 - Los Angeles

Samuel Cullers, State Office of Planning  
William Atherton, Assembly Science and Technology Advisory Council  
Barry Siegel, Urban Coalition Liaison  
Frederick Eissler, Scenic Shoreline Preservation Conference  
Mrs. Ellen Stern Harris, Council for Planning and Conservation  
Richard Ball, Sierra Club  
Mrs. Pat Ellison, Environmental Coalition of Ventura County  
Mrs. Darlene Mitcheltree, The Watchful Eye  
Dr. L. Douglas DeNike, Zero Population Growth

Alex Man, Federation of Organizations for Conserving Urban Space (FOCUS)  
Mrs. Faye S. Hove, California Citizens' Freeway Association  
Dr. Norman Saunders, Department of Geography, UC, Santa Barbara  
Mr. and Mrs. Tasker L. Edmiston, Desert Protective Council, Inc.  
Dr. Sherman Griselle, American Institute of Planners  
Mrs. Howard Allen, Desert Protective Council, Inc.  
Gerald Fox, Environmental Clearinghouse  
Lyle Taylor (re Owens Valley)  
Dr. Gary Herbertson, United Methodist Church  
William A. Wilcoxsen, Attorney  
Mrs. Virginia Kessels, The Watchful Eye  
Bruce G. Sharky, College of Environmental Design, California Polytechnic  
Mrs. Pauline Koch, People's Action Research  
Graham O. Smith, Save Malibu Canyon Committee  
Charles A. Grayer  
John A. Hobbs  
Mrs. Dorothea Edmiston, Citizens Coordinate for Century III  
George Nishimura  
G. McHinley, University of Southern California

### NOISE ABATEMENT COMMITTEE

October 29, 1970 - Inglewood

(This session was held by Committee, EQSC staff and Counsel, and the newly-appointed Scientific Advisory Group on Noise, listed in Appendix \_\_\_)

## Committee Study Session Participants

### SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

September 15, 1970 - Sacramento

Z. Harry Astor, Attorney at Law  
John Moscone, Golden Gate  
Disposal Company  
William Ohanesian, System  
Disposal Service  
Carl Sexton, Los Angeles  
By-Products Company  
Dewey Vittori, Oakland  
Scavenger Company  
Tom Walters, Redwood Empire  
Disposal Corporation  
Robert Bargman, Director, Los  
Angeles City Bureau of  
Sanitation  
Lester A. Haug, County Sani-  
tation Districts of Los Angeles  
Don Benninghoven, League of  
California Cities  
Randy Hamilton, League of  
California Cities  
Sam Sanchez, League of  
California Cities  
Terry McGuire, State Air  
Resources Board  
Dr. John M. Heslep, State  
Department of Public Health  
Lawrence A. Burch, State  
Department of Public Health  
Peter A. Rogers, State Water  
Resources Control Board  
James Pardau, Consultant,  
Assembly Committee on Natural  
Resources and Conservation  
Lloyd Lapham, Consultant,  
Senate Select Committee on  
Environmental Control

November 17, 1970 - Sacramento

A. Harry Astor, Attorney at Law  
John Moscone, Golden Gate  
Disposal Company  
Lester A. Haug, County Sani-  
tation Districts, Los Angeles  
Robert Bargman, Director, Los  
Angeles City Bureau of  
Sanitation  
Ralph McGill, California Refuse  
Removal Council  
Don Benninghoven, League of  
California Cities  
John Tooker, Resources Agency  
Jerome B. Gilbert, Water Resources  
Control Board  
Lloyd Lapham, Consultant, Senate  
Select Committee on Environmental  
Control  
James Cornelius, Water Resources  
Control Board  
Press representatives from:  
Associated Press, Capitol News  
Service, Metromedia News,  
Sacramento Bee, Sacramento  
Union, and United Press  
International

### WATER RESOURCES COMMITTEE

February 16, 1970, and June 5, 1970-  
Sacramento

Water Resources Control Board  
Jerome B. Gilbert, Executive  
Officer  
Winfred W. Adams, Member  
Norman B. Hume, Member  
Ronald B. Robie, Member  
Kenneth L. Woodward, Chief,  
Water Rights Division  
Department of Public Health  
Henry J. Ongerth, Chief  
Bureau of Sanitary Engineering

---

---

APPENDIX E

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY STUDY COUNCIL -  
ENABLING LEGISLATION

---

---

## APPENDIX E

### ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY STUDY COUNCIL - THE ENABLING LEGISLATION

#### **PART 14. ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY STUDY COUNCIL [NEW]**

Chapter	Section
1. State Policy .....	16000
2. Definitions .....	16020
3. Organization and Membership of the Council .....	16050
4. Powers and Duties of the Council .....	16080

*Part 14 added by Stats.1968, c. 1380, p. 2711, § 1; Stats.1968, c. 1395, p. 2751, § 1.*

#### **CHAPTER I. STATE POLICY**

Sec.  
16000. Finding.  
16001. Need of study.

*Chapter 1 added by Stats.1968, c. 1380, p. 2711, § 1; Stats.1968, c. 1395, p. 2751, § 1.*

##### **§ 16000. Finding**

The Legislature finds that:

(a) Rapid population growth, economic development and urbanization have affected the quality of California's natural environment.

(b) The proliferation of noise from transportation sources have led to the exposure of large sectors of the populace to an unacceptable degree of noise.

(c) The anticipated rates of construction of new airports and extension of existing airports, construction of freeways and mass rapid transit lines, and the introduction into service of intraurban short takeoff and land and vertical takeoff and land aircraft operating at low cruising altitudes will rapidly escalate the urban noise problem unless systematic preventive measures are taken.

(d) There is a large discrepancy between the technology available for control of urban noise and the degree to which it is being utilized in practice, through such means as land use planning, noise control provisions in building design and construction, and legal control over the movements of noise-producing transportation vehicles.

(e) Improvement of the quality of California's physical environment consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the state is a matter of statewide, regional, and local concern calling for coordinated public and private action in the interest of the health, safety, and welfare of present and future generations.

(Added by Stats.1968, c. 1380, p. 2711, § 1; Stats.1968, c. 1395, p. 2751, § 1. Amended by Stats.1969, c. 1012, p. —, § 1.)

The word "consistent" following "environment" was not contained in the addition by Stats.1968, c. 1380, p. 2711, § 1.

Asterisks \* \* \* indicate deletions by amendment

## § 16001

## GOVERNMENT CODE

### § 16001. Need of study

An in-depth study is needed:

(a) To define the interrelationship of resources management, land use and transportation policies, and other matters, including noise emissions, that affect environmental quality.

(b) To determine whether existing approaches to the protection, management, and improvement of environmental quality are adequate for effective, long-range solutions to the problems.

(c) To recommend appropriate action necessary to effectively protect, manage, and improve environmental quality on a long-range basis.

(Added by Stats.1968, c. 1380, p. 2711, § 1; Stats.1968, c. 1395, p. 2752, § 1.)

The text of both 1968 additions was identical.

## CHAPTER 2. DEFINITIONS

### Sec.

16020. Council.

16021. Environmental quality.

16022. Waste management.

Chapter 2 added by Stats.1968, c. 1380, p. 2711, § 1; Stats.1968, c. 1395, p. 2752, § 1.

### § 16020. Council

"Council" means the State Environmental Quality Study Council.

(Added by Stats.1968, c. 1380, p. 2711, § 1; Stats.1968, c. 1395, p. 2752, § 1.)

The text of both 1968 additions was identical.

### § 16021. Environmental quality

"Environmental quality" means the characteristics or conditions and relative degree of excellence of the physical and biological constituents of man's surroundings.

(Added by Stats.1968, c. 1380, p. 2711, § 1; Stats.1968, c. 1395, p. 2752, § 1.)

The text of both 1968 additions was identical.

### § 16022. Waste management

"Waste management" means the organized and systematic actions by which waste products are utilized, or collected, processed, and disposed without an unreasonable adverse effect upon man's environment.

(Added by Stats.1968, c. 1380, p. 2711, § 1; Stats.1968, c. 1395, p. 2752, § 1.)

The text of both 1968 additions was identical.

## CHAPTER 3. ORGANIZATION AND MEMBERSHIP OF THE COUNCIL

### Sec.

16050. Existence.

16051. Composition.

16052. Nonvoting members.

16053. Chairman.

16054. Termination of council.

16055. Reports.

Chapter 3 added by Stats.1968, c. 1380, p. 2712, § 1; Stats.1968, c. 1395, p. 2752, § 1.

### § 16050. Existence

There is in the state government the State Environmental Quality Study Council.

(Added by Stats.1968, c. 1380, p. 2712, § 1; Stats.1968, c. 1395, p. 2752, § 1.)

### Library references

States 45.

C.J.S. States §§ 52, 66.

The text of both 1968 additions was identical.



**§ 16051. Composition**

The council consists of the following membership:

Secretary of the Resources Agency.

Secretary of the Business and Transportation Agency.

Chairman of the State Water Resources Control Board.

Chairman of the State Air Resources Board.

Seven public members appointed by the Governor, who shall have demonstrated interest in, and knowledge of, the protection, management, and improvement of the quality of California's physical environment. One of the seven public members appointed by the Governor, in addition to the qualifications specified in this section, shall represent the solid waste management industry and one of the seven public members appointed by the Governor shall represent city and county government, as selected from the city and county members on the Intergovernmental Council on Urban Growth.

Four members, two of whom shall be appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly, and two by the Senate Rules Committee.

(Added by Stats.1968, c. 1380, p. 2712, § 1; Stats.1968, c. 1395, p. 2752, § 1.)

The text of both 1968 additions was identical.

**§ 16052. Nonvoting members**

In addition to the members specified pursuant to Section 16051, the council consists of the following nonvoting ex officio membership:

Director of Public Health

Director of Agriculture

Director of Parks and Recreation

Director of Fish and Game

Director of Conservation

Director of Public Works

Director of Water Resources

Director of Housing and Community Development

City and county members of the Intergovernmental Council on Urban Growth  
(Added by Stats.1968, c. 1380, p. 2712, § 1; Stats.1968, c. 1395, p. 2753, § 1.)

The text of both 1968 additions was identical.

**§ 16052.1. Same: Members of Legislature constituting joint investigative committee.**

In addition to the members specified pursuant to Sections 16051 and 16052, the council consists of one Member of the Senate, appointed by the Senate Rules Committee, and one Member of the Assembly, appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly, who shall meet with, and participate in the activities of the council to the extent that such participation is not incompatible with their respective positions as Members of the Legislature. For the purposes of this part, such Members of the Legislature shall constitute a joint investigating committee on the subject of this part, and as such shall have the powers and duties imposed upon such committees by the Joint Rules of the Senate and Assembly. [Added by Stats 1970 ch 163 § 1.]

**§ 16053. Same: Chairman.**

The Governor shall designate the chairman of the council. [Added by Stats 1968 ch 1395 § 1.]

See note to § 16000.

**Note.**—There was an identical section of this number which was added by Stats 1968 ch 1380 § 1 and repealed by Stats 1970 ch 346 § 9.

See note to § 945.6.

**§ 16054. Same: Termination of existence.**

The council shall cease to exist upon the adjournment sine die of the 1972 [1] Regular Session of Legislature. [Added by Stats 1968 ch 1395 § 1; Amended by Stats 1970 ch 1142 § 1.]

[1] "1972" substituted for "1971" in 1970.

See note to § 16000.

**Note.**—There was an identical section of this number which was added by Stats 1968 ch 1380 § 1 and repealed by Stats 1970 ch 346 § 9.

See note to § 945.6.

**§ 16055. Same: Progress reports: Final report: Recommendations.**

The council shall make progress reports to the Governor and to the Legislature on February 1, 1969, on February 1, 1970, and on February 1, 1971 [1]; and shall make a final report to the Governor and to the Legislature on February 1, 1972 [2], at which time the council shall make recommendations as to how its powers and duties can best be carried out in the future.

*There is hereby continuously appropriated from the California Environmental Protection Program Fund as created by Senate Bill 262 of the 1970 Regular Session of the Legislature to the council sufficient funds for the necessary expenses of the council in the performance of its duties. [1]* [Added by Stats 1968 ch 1395 § 1; Amended by Stats 1970 ch 1142 § 2.]

[1] Italicized material preceding [1] added in 1970.

[2] "1972" substituted for "1971" in 1970.

See note to § 16000.

**Note.**—There was an identical section of this number which was added by Stats 1968 ch 1380 § 1 and repealed by Stats 1970 ch 346 § 9.

See note to § 945.6.

## § 16080

## GOVERNMENT CODE

### CHAPTER 4. POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE COUNCIL

Sec.

16080. Mandatory duties.

16081. Discretionary powers.

*Chapter 4 added by Stats.1968, c. 1380, p. 2712, § 1; Stats.1968, c. 1395, p. 2753, § 1.*

#### § 16080. Mandatory duties

The council shall:

(a) Make a thorough study of relevant policies, practices, and programs in the state that relate significantly to environmental quality, including noise emission control.

(b) Identify major environmental quality problems, giving consideration to all of the possible interrelationships between the degradation or improvement of air, land, and water resources.

(c) Develop long-range goals and make recommendations, after holding public hearings, as to policies, criteria, and programs as guides in the protection, management, and improvement of California's environmental quality.

(d) Identify problems in existing environmental quality control efforts in the state, including unmet or inadequately met needs, undesirable overlaps or conflicts in jurisdiction, between or among federal, state, regional, and local agencies, and any efforts that may be unnecessary or undesirable.

(e) Recommend, after holding public hearings, such legislative and administrative actions as may be necessary to establish goals, policies, and criteria and to implement programs that will effectively protect, manage, and improve environmental quality on a long-range basis.

(f) Review and make recommendations, after holding public hearings, on proper state, regional, or local governmental mechanisms, which would formulate broad policies, objectives and criteria for the coordinated protection, management, and improvement of California's physical environment.

(g) Make recommendations for immediate action by state agencies as defined in Section 11000 of the Government Code which would effectively preserve and enhance California's natural environment.

(h) Appoint a scientific advisory group to consider and report to the council on the state of the art of urban noise-control technology and to recommend appropriate actions necessary to effectively protect, manage, and improve the noise environment on a long-range basis. This advisory group shall be composed of not less than five nor more than 10 members. To provide the necessary depth and breadth in modern acoustics, members of the scientific advisory group shall be practicing acoustical engineers.

(i) Avail itself of technical information available from federal agencies involved in research and administrative measures for the control of noise such as the Departments of Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Health, Education and Welfare. Specifically, the council shall apprise itself of technical advisement available from the Interagency Aircraft Noise Abatement Program, including its Land Use and Airports Panel and its Legislative and Legal Panel.

*(Added by Stats.1968, c. 1380, p. 2712, § 1; Stats.1968, c. 1395, p. 2753, § 1. Amended by Stats.1969, c. 1042, p. —, § 2.)*

GOVERNMENT CODE

§ 16081

§ 16081. Discretionary powers

The council may:

- (a) Appoint an executive secretary and other staff.
  - (b) Receive and disburse federal, state, or local funds.
  - (c) Contract for services.
  - (d) Hold public hearings.
  - (e) Appoint such advisory groups as may be necessary to carry out its powers and duties.
  - (f) Call upon any state agency for assistance in carrying out its objectives.
- (Added by Stats.1968, c. 1380, p. 2713, § 1; Stats.1968, c. 1395, p. 2754, § 1.)
- The text of both 1968 additions was identical.

---

APPENDIX F

CHART - STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
ACTIVITIES AFFECTING  
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
AND IMPROVEMENT

---

	Land Use	Water Resources	Air Resources	Solid Waste Management	Noise Abatement	General
AGRICULTURE AND SERVICES AGENCY Department of Agriculture	1. Works with cities, counties, and land-owners in administering agricultural preserves under the California Land Conservation Act of 1965. Government Code, Section 51200-51295. *(\$13) (\$13) (\$13)		1. Conducts surveys to detect plant pests and conditions new to the state or area. Plant damage caused by air pollutants is measured and reported. Agricultural Code Section 401, 461, 5321. (\$20) (\$29) (\$46)	1. Regulates the method of disposal of ships' garbage and the feeding of garbage to hogs. Agricultural Code, Section 16001-16154, 10901-10990. (\$58) (\$58) (\$58)		1. License each pesticide product and persons selling, or applying agricultural pesticides for hire. Agricultural Code, Section 12811, 12101-12107, 11701-11705. (\$564) (\$645) (\$729) 2. Designates pesticides that are injurious materials or injurious herbicides requiring a permit from County Agricultural Commissioner, before purchase and use. Agricultural Code, Section 14001-14033. (\$334) (\$372) (\$484) 3. Analyzes samples of fruit, vegetables, feed, milk, and meat for pesticide residues and stops sale of lots with excess residue. Agricultural Code, Section 12581-12801. 4. Works with Water Resources Control Board and Departments of Public Health, Fish and Game, and the University of California in evaluating proposed uses of pesticides. Agricultural Code, Section 12824, 14102, 14103.
BUSINESS AND TRANSPORTATION AGENCY Department of Aeronautics					1. Establishes noise standards to a point not prohibited by federal law with which all civil aircraft operating from permitted airports in California must comply effective January 1, 1971. Public Utilities Code, Section 21669-21669.4. (\$0) (\$31) (\$20) 2. Noise standards can be different for each classification of airport. 3. Noise standard violation is a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a \$1000 fine for each infraction. 4. As condition of site approval make determination that advantages to public of future airport sites outweigh disadvantages to environment. (\$0) (\$0) (\$0) 5. In the future sponsor must include in his request for airport funding a statement of the environmental impact. (\$0) (\$0) (\$0)	

\* Where available, costs for programs (in thousands of dollars) are shown in

\* Where available, costs for programs (in thousands of dollars) are shown in parenthesis following text for fiscal years (1968-69) (1969-70) (1970-71).



State Agency	Land Use	Water Resources	Air Resources	Solid Waste Management	Noise Abatement	General
Department of California Highway Patrol			1. Inspect vehicles for required exhaust emission control devices. Vehicle Code, Section 2814 (\$218) (\$231) (\$240) 2. License and regulate official pollution control stations, Vehicle Code, Section 2500-2504, 2520-2523, 2540-2549, 12303, 27153, 27153.5,, and 27156. (\$269) (\$332) (\$278)	1. Enforce against throwing lighted objects or litter from vehicles along highways. Vehicle Code, Section 23111, 23112, 23115. Penal Code, Section 374b, Health and Safety Code, Section 13001-13002. (\$6) (\$7) (\$7)	1. Excessive noise research and highway enforcement. Vehicle Code, Section 23130, 27150, 27151, 27160. (\$108) (\$191) (\$268) 2. Technical assistance provided by Safety Services Division.	
Department of Housing and Community Development	1. May assist State Office of Planning. 2. Assists local governments with re-development programs. 3. Provides statistics and research service on housing and community development. (\$100) (\$100) (\$100) 4. Conducts demonstration projects. 5. Assists local government and private groups in developing housing.	1. Assists local government and other state agencies with housing and community development projects associated with development of water sources and resulting recreation facilities.	1. Assists local government and other state agencies in developing a healthy residential environment including compatible industrial growth patterns with clean air as a major consideration.	1. The Department has statutory authority relating to waste disposal under authority granted in the Health and Safety Code applicable to buildings subject to provisions of the State Housing Law, to buildings and installations within mobilehome parks, and also to buildings subject to provisions of the Employee Housing Act. Labor Code. (\$250) (\$250) (\$250) 2. The Department has in force and effect regulations in the above areas.	1. The Department has statutory authority relating to noise abatement applicable to buildings subject to provisions of the State Housing Law, Division 13, Part 1.5. (\$0) (\$1) (\$1) 2. The Division of Building and Housing Standards is now in the process of developing proposed regulations in this area.	
Department of Motor Vehicles			1. Evidence of smog control device a prerequisite to motor vehicle registration. Vehicle Code, Section 4000.1, 4000.2, and 24007(b). (\$373) (\$404) (\$485)	1. Regulates the disposal of abandoned or wrecked motor vehicles. Vehicle Code, Section 11500-11522, and 22650-22856.		1. Administers the sale of personalized license plates to finance the California Environmental Protection Program Fund. Vehicle Code, Section 5100-5110 (\$0) (\$0) (\$1,143)
Department of Public Works	1. The Department of Public Works has been engaged in comprehensive regional transportation studies in 10 urban areas of California. Such cooperating agencies as SCAG ABAG, Sacramento Regional Area Planning Commission and the Comprehensive Planning Organization in San Diego are furnishing basic land use information for these studies. 2. Individual route and project considerations include socio-economic environmental studies, joint use, protection of scenic corridors, planting and roadside rests.	1. Highway design procedures and construction techniques to assure protection of water quality. Standard Special Provisions (since 1960) have provided that highway contractors must avoid working in flowing streams and causing siltation of rivers and streams.  A Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of Public Works and the Department of Fish and Game (March 10, 1961) specifies measures to be employed to preserve or enhance fish and wildlife resources during highway construction.	1. Conducts studies of motor vehicle related air pollution. California Highway Commission Action. (\$0) (\$640) (\$527) 2. The following studies are being conducted as the result of action of the California Highway Commission. a. Conversion of State vehicles to operate on low emission fuels. (\$90) (\$167) b. Evaluation of low emission devices for new and used cars. (\$190) (\$100)	1. Litter control and sweeping programs plus maintenance of roadside rests and vista points. Streets and Highways Code, Sections 27 and 101.6.  Cost of litter control and sweeping: (\$3,370) (\$4,410) (\$5,200)  Cost of maintenance of roadside rests and vista points: (\$550) (\$872) (\$1,140)	1. Noise study on the use of physical barriers built parallel to the freeway to separate surrounding community from traffic noise. 2. Joint project with the California Highway Patrol to demonstrate feasibility of further reducing noise limits for trucks and motorcycles.	

State Agency	Land Use	Water Resources	Air Resources	Solid Waste Management	Noise Abatement	General
Department of Public Works (Continued)	3. Community and Environmental Factors Units (CEFU) have been established in each Highways District. California Administrative Code, Section 1451; Streets and Highways Code, Sections 210-214; Department of Transportation Act, Section 4(f); 1968 Federal Highway Act; 1969 Public Law 91-190 National Environmental Policy Act; 1970 Chapter 1433; Marler-Johnson Highway Park Act of 1969; Government Code, Sections 54220-54223; Streets and Highways Code, Sections 75.5, and 135.3-135.7. (\$10,681) (\$13,070) (\$14,943)	The capping of existing abandoned wells is required in connection with new highway construction to prevent contamination of water bearing strata. Coordinated investigations are done by the Department of Water Resources.  Fish and Game Code, Sections 1505, 1600, 1601, 1602, 5650, 12015; Water Code, Sections 13700-13806. (\$33) (\$82)	c. An inspection and maintenance pilot study to determine methods of reducing exhaust emissions from motor vehicles. (\$400) (\$50) d. Total air contaminants from the vehicle population. (\$50) (\$50) e. Control of emissions from the construction process (asphalt plants, rock producing plants, construction equipment). (\$40) (\$40) 3. Study of the use of low-lead and no-lead gasoline to determine the operational effects of State cars when operated on no-lead or low-lead gasoline.  1. Regulates exposures to hazardous substances in places of employment, in particular, pesticides, radioactive material, and emission from vehicles operated in enclosed spaces. Labor Code, Section 6311, 6313-6316, and 6418-6420. (\$199) (\$225) (\$209)		3. Develop criteria related to traffic noise and the use of land in the vicinity of freeways. Streets and Highways Code, Sections 75.7 and 1298.	
HUMAN RELATIONS AGENCY  Department of Industrial Relations					1. Industrial safety orders contain regulations on excessive noise.	
Department of Public Health	1. No specific statutory authority, but the Department has a broad interest in land use and land use policies because of the strong significance they have to many determinants of health. Health and Safety Code, Section 205-211, 2521, 18897-18897.7.	1. Assuring the safety, purity, wholesomeness, and potability of domestic water supplies. Health and Safety Code Section 200-211, 4001-4002, 4010-4055, 4450-4471; Water Code, Section 13144-13165, 13411-13413; Revenue and Taxation Code, Section 17226. 2. Prevent contamination of State's waters from sewage and other wastes. Health and Safety Code, Section 200-211; 3050-3052, 4400-4461, 5410-5463; Water Code, Section 13165, 13240, 13411-13413, 13540-13541.	1. Develops and recommends air quality standards based on health. Health and Safety Code, Section 200-211, 425, 39051, 39052. 2. Conducts studies on health effects of air pollution. Health and Safety Code, Section 200-211, 425, 39051-39052.	1. Conducting study of solid waste problems and needs of California to: a. Determine current policies, practices, and programs in the State. b. Assess and evaluate current solid waste problems and make projections of future problems.	1. No specific statutory authority, but the Department has several staff members expert in the field, who conduct noise studies and provide advice and assistance relative to community and occupational noise problems, in recognition that noise is a significant environmental factor. Health and Safety Code, Section 205-211, 429.11.	1. Pesticide - interprets data on health effects of chemical agents in the environment. Health and Safety Code, Section 205-211, 429.11; Agricultural Code, Section 14103. (\$972)** (\$570)** (\$559)**

\*\*Costs shown include costs for Radiological Health which are not limited to air but no separate cost estimates are available.

State Agency	Land Use	Water Resources	Air Resources	Solid Waste Management	Noise Abatement	General
Department of Public Health (Continued)		3. Establish standards for reclamation of waste water. Health and Safety Code, Section 200-211; Water Code, Section 13411-13413, 13520-13523.  4. Assuring sanitation and safety of water recreational areas and public swimming pools. Health and Safety Code, Section 200-211, 4050-4055, 4462-4471, 24100-24159.  5. Assuring that shellfish do not cause poisoning or disease (as a result of conditions of water in which they grow). Health and Safety Code, Section 200-211; Fish and Game Code, Section 5670-5674. (\$1,222) (\$1,472) (\$1,393)	3. Provides laboratory and other support to the Air Resources Board. Health and Safety Code Section 425, 39023, 39052; Revenue and Taxation Code, Section 24372.  4. Radiological Health - Maintains surveillance of environmental media (air, water, food, soil) for radiation levels. Controls users of radioactive materials to prevent harmful escape or disposal of materials. Health and Safety Code, Section 203-211, 4400-4404, 5410-5463, 25600-25876.	c. Evaluate existing state of the art and promising new developments as regards criteria, techniques and methods for dealing with solid wastes. Health and Safety Code, Section 200-215.  2. Provides advice and assistance to local government in solid waste management problems. Health and Safety Code, Section 205-215, 5410-5463. 3. (See Water Resources Column for Department's concern with water-borne wastes, and Air Resources Column relative to air-borne wastes.) (\$70) (\$70) (\$70)		2. Vector Control - Obtains effective control of environmental conditions and carriers of animal-borne disease. Health and Safety Code, Section 200-215, 1800-1813, 2425-2426; Agricultural Code, Section 6021. (\$868) (\$639) (\$646)
RESOURCES AGENCY	1. Chapter 988, Statutes of 1968, established the Secretary for Resources as a member of the California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and the Bi-State Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. The purpose of these agencies is to provide the proper planning for the development of the Tahoe Basin while preserving the integrity of the Lake itself. Since its establishment, either or both agencies have been funded through an appropriation in the budget of the Resources Agency. (\$15) (\$65) (\$50)	1. The Secretary for Resources has been authorized by Governor Reagan to coordinate the State of California's comments on the following: a. All investigations of and reports on water development, flood control and related projects of the U. S. Department of the Interior. b. Reports on projects of the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers. c. Projects pertaining to the Federal Power Commission. d. Soil Conservation Projects (PL-566) of the U. S. Department of Agriculture. These comments include the effect of the proposed project on the environment of the State of California.	1. The California Resources Agency was designated by Governor Reagan on March 12, 1969, as the State entity to coordinate the activities of all state agencies relative to thermal power plant siting. The Secretary for Resources has created a power plant siting committee to advise him on these matters and has delegated this responsibility to that committee.  2. It should be noted that while air pollution is a major consideration, the Committee studies the total environmental effect of any proposal.			
Air Resources Board			1. Coordinates statewide air pollution control activities. Health and Safety Code, Section 39052. (\$148) (\$200) (\$237)  2. Determines the nature, cause, occurrence, and effects of air pollution. Health and Safety Code Section 39052. (\$524) (\$707) (\$1,007)			

State Agency	Land Use	Water Resources	Air Resources	Solid Waste Management	Noise Abatement	General
Air Resources Board (Continued)			3. Establishes air basins throughout the State and adopts air quality standards for these basins. Health and Safety Code, Section 39051. (\$107) (\$144) (\$100) 4. Makes an inventory of sources in each basin, reviews regulations of local control agencies, provides technical assistance to these agencies and enforces the air quality standards when local agencies fail to do so. Health and Safety Code, Section 39051, 39052 and 39054. (\$152) (\$206) (\$305) 5. Monitors air pollutants and collects data. Health and Safety Code, Section 39052. (\$487) (\$656) (\$1,105) 6. Adopts motor vehicle emission standards and test procedures, approves emission control systems, and maintains surveillance of emissions from control systems. Health and Safety Code, Section 39051 and 39052. (\$698) (\$942) (\$1,585) 7. Conducts research on air pollution. Health and Safety Code, Section 39067. (\$3,000) <sup>a/</sup>			
Bay Conservation and Development Commission	1. Has specific and limited jurisdiction over strip of land 100 feet inland from the shoreline of the bay to: a. require maximum feasible public access to the bay in all substantial new developments, and b. to reserve certain areas for priority water-related uses such as ports, water-related industry, and water-related recreation to reduce need for future bay filling. (\$208) (\$183) (\$266)	1. Protects San Francisco Bay for present and future generations. Encourages development of the bay and its shoreline to their highest potential with a minimum of bay filling. Title 7.2, Government Code.	1. B.C.D.C. studies and B.C.D.C. Bay Plan indicate the importance of the water surface of the bay in moderating the climate of the bay area and in helping to combat smog.	1. Bay Plan prohibits further use of bay simply as a dumping ground for wastes.		
Colorado River Board		1. Develop feasible and acceptable plans for augmenting the natural waters of the Colorado River System, and the implementation of these plans by the Federal Government and the affected states. Part 5 of Division 6 of the Water Code. (\$89) (\$114) (\$93)				

a/ Portion of three year program required by 1970 legislation.

State Agency	Land Use	Water Resources	Air Resources	Solid Waste Management	Noise Abatement	General
Colorado River Board (Continued)		2. Develop and implement federal and interstate programs to preserve and/or enhance the existing quality of the Colorado River. Part 5 of Division 6 of the Water Code. (\$59) (\$66) (\$54)				
Department of Conservation	1. Division of Forestry is responsible for prevention of fires and related forest programs on 38,000,000 acres of state and privately owned lands. Specific Code and Section not cited. (\$2,764) (\$3,091) (\$3,101) 2. Division of Mines and Geology hazards program seeks to identify and evaluate potentially hazardous geologic conditions, Public Resources Code, Division 1, Chapter 2, Article 3 and Division 2. (\$311) (\$446) (\$671) 3. Division of Oil and Gas regulates spacing of petroleum, gas and geothermal wells and under subsidence abatement program ameliorates subsidence on the Wilmington oil field, Los Angeles County. Public Resources Code, Division 3. (\$2) (\$12) (\$14) 4. Division of Soil Conservation plans small watershed projects under the Federal Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act.	1. Division of Oil and Gas supervises drilling of oil, gas and geothermal wells so as to, among other things, protect fresh water resources from contamination. Public Resources Code, Division 3. (\$180) (\$195) (\$280) 2. Division of Forestry protects and revegetates forest, grass and brushlands to assure water production. Specific Code and Sections not cited. (\$1,939) (\$2,168) (\$2,091) 3. Division of Soil Conservation develops small water conservation projects in cooperation with local entities. (\$569) (\$563) (\$275) 4. Division of Mines and Geology assists Regional Water Quality Control Boards in establishing standards of water quality relating to mining operations. (\$15) (\$20) (\$25)	1. Division of Oil and Gas has regulations prohibiting the blowing of natural gas to the air. Public Resources Code, Division 3. (\$24) (\$26) (\$28)	1. Division of Forestry regulates use of fire. The Division of Mines and Geology provides data on sites. Public Resources Code, Division 2, Section 2205. 2. Division of Oil and Gas regulates the disposal of oil field brines. Public Resources Code, Division 3. (\$60) (\$140) (\$210)		
Department of Fish and Game	1. Department owns and operates 115,300 acres of land most of which is waterfowl or deer habitat. These lands are managed to maintain a high environmental quality for both wildlife and man. Fish and Game Code, Section 1525. (\$917) (\$920) (\$920)	1. Fish and Game Code prohibits pollution of state waters with materials deleterious to fish, plant, or bird life. Fish and Game Code, Section 5650. (\$416) (\$420) (\$420) 2. Prohibits mining activities that permit effluents or tailings to enter waters of Trinity-Klamath River District during specific periods of the year. Fish and Game Code, Section 5800. (\$26) (\$26) (\$26) 3. Investigates all situations where water quality is deteriorating. Coordinates with Regional Water Quality Control Board in setting waste discharge requirements and water quality control plans and policies. Fish and Game Code, Section 5651. 4. Performs studies to assess the impacts of various developments on water quality. Fish and Game Code, Section 5651, 1601 and 1602. (\$1,183) (\$1,190) (\$1,190) 5. For protection of fish and wildlife resources, provides recommendations for modifications to construction affecting natural flow in lakes or streambeds. Fish and Game Code, Section 1601 et seq.		1. Fish and Game Code prohibits deposition of litter in or near state waters. Fish and Game Code, Section 5652.		1. Monitors pesticide levels in wildlife and works with pesticide users to develop and insure satisfactory application methods. Fish and Game Code, Section 1008. (\$160) (\$165) (\$165)

State Agency	Land Use	Water Resources	Air Resources	Solid Waste Management	Noise Abatement	General
Department of Navigation and Ocean Development	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DNOD under the policy direction of the Interagency Council for Ocean Resources is preparing the California Comprehensive Ocean Area Plan (COAP), which will be implemented by DNOD and various county and local governments. Government Code, Section 8800.</li> <li>2. The COAP will express state policy and criteria for land-use allocation in the coastal zone,</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The California Comprehensive Ocean Area Plan will provide for (a) orderly efficient development and wise use of all marine and coastal resources consistent with sound conservation principles; and (b) maintaining and improving the quality of the marine and coastal environment.</li> <li>2. The COAP will provide for wise use and conservation of water resources. (\$0) (\$100) (\$262)</li> </ol>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DNOD requires waste disposal facilities in marinas constructed with state funds. State Administrative Code, Section 5200.</li> <li>2. DNOD has convened a Vessel Waste Management Task Force to seek equitable, practical, and economical means of dealing with vessel waste which will be compatible with forthcoming federal regulations in this field.</li> </ol>		
Department of Parks and Recreation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Director shall maintain and keep up-to-date a comprehensive plan for the development of the outdoor recreation resources of the State and shall coordinate his activities with and represent the interests of all state and local agencies having an interest in planning, developing, and maintaining outdoor recreation resources and facilities. Public Resources Code, Sections 5099.2 and 5099.3. (\$49) (\$65) (\$72)</li> <li>2. Identifies, evaluates and inventories the scenic and historical resources of the State, and identifies elements which are inadequately preserved, managed, or protected in relation to the total environment. Public Resources Code, Section 541, 5003. (\$40) (\$45) (\$50)</li> <li>3. Through the medium of the State Park System, establishes, preserves, manages and operates for public use and enjoyment those natural, recreational and historical units which will make the greatest contribution to the overall quality of life in California. Public Resources Code, Section 541, 5001.5, 5003, 5013, 5017, 5020-5025 and 5096.1. (\$16,500) (\$19,400) (\$19,800)</li> <li>4. Works with local agencies of government, through state and federal grants, and on a consulting and cooperating basis toward the establishment of city, county and regional parks, recreation areas and historical units which are important to California's environmental quality. Reviews statewide proposal for federal, state, and local public works projects for their effect on environmental quality, especially as they concern recreation, parks, open space, scenic resources and state water projects. Public Resources Code, Section 541, 542, 5005, 5099; Government Code, Sections 54220-54223. (\$5,500) (\$10,200) (\$6,200)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Department studies federal water projects with respect to its area of interest, and reports on the extent of state participation therein. The Department cooperates and participates in the development of recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement at federal water projects. Public Resources Code, Sections 5094.2 and 5094.3</li> <li>2. The Department designs, constructs, operates and maintains recreation facilities at state water projects, and manages project lands and water surfaces for recreation use. Water Code, Section 11918.</li> </ol>				



State Agency	Land Use	Water Resources	Air Resources	Solid Waste Management	Noise Abatement	General
Department of Parks and Recreation (Continued)	5. Maintains a continuing surveillance of total environmental quality throughout the State in relation to the Department's prime responsibilities, and recommends corrective measures as appropriate to prevent the deterioration of natural beauty. Public Resources Code, Section 5097, 6818; Penal Code, Section 622. (\$30) (\$35) (\$40) 6. Through its program for public information and interpretation, informs the public concerning the environment, its appreciation and enjoyment, and its protection or enhancement. (\$15) (\$20) (\$20)					
Department of Water Resources	1. Conducts studies of land use, land classification, and population distribution to determine present and future water requirements. Water Code, Section 225, 226, 12616. (\$647) (\$632) (\$549) 2. Owns or controls about 130,000 acres of land as a part of water resources development projects. Water Code, Section 250 et seq. 3. Provides flood protection for millions of acres of land directly through state owned and operated projects and indirectly through financial reimbursement to local governments for land acquisition for federal flood control projects. Water Code, Section 12570 et seq. (\$16,100) (\$14,700) (\$6,800) 4. Provides liaison between federal and local agencies in floodplain management. Water Code, Section 8300.1, 12604. 5. Administers the Cobey-Alquist Floodplain Management Act, to assure adoption of local zoning for floodplain management. Water Code, Section 8400 et seq. (\$29) (\$36) (\$32) 6. Constructs and operates the State Water Project and provides financial assistance for construction of local projects as part of the State Water Facilities. Water Code, Section 12880 et seq., 12931 et seq. (\$14,100) (\$11,900) (\$8,400) 7. Plans for implementation of waste water reclamation and saline water conversion projects to relieve demands on the use of the State's water resources for water supply and waste disposal. Water Code, Section 230, 12984. (\$86) (\$180) (\$337) 8. Evaluate impact of water resources development or management action on all phases of the environment, and evaluate the impact of non-water-oriented projects or actions on the water phase of the environment. Chapter 1433, Statute of 1970	1. Assures that water of suitable quality is available to meet the present and future water requirements of the State most effectively Water Code, Section 10004 et seq. (\$2,534) (\$2,847) (\$2,594) 2. Provides for development, utilization, and protection of quantity and quality of water resources through broad authority to investigate, plan, and implement physical works or management, techniques. Water Code, Section 229, 231, 12616 et seq., 13750-51, 13800. 3. Collects and maintains a data bank on quantity and quality of water resources, through about 230 stream sampling, 2,000 ground water sampling stations, and numerous waste water sources. Water Code, Section 226. (\$580) (\$574) (\$565) 4. Plans under broad authority for water resources development or management to control water quality, enhance fish and wildlife habitat, provide for recreational use. Water Code, Section 11900 et seq., 12581, 12582. (\$165) (\$254) (\$238) 5. Provides technical advice and information to State Water Quality Control Boards in fulfillment of their responsibilities. Water Code, Section 13225(c). (\$200) (\$225) (\$190)	1. Licenses and monitors weather modification activities, such as artificial nucleation of air masses by ground emissions. Water Code, Section 400-415. (\$30) (\$53) (\$50)	1. Conduct investigations regarding effects of waste disposal on ground water and surface water resources Water Code, Section 229. 2. Advises the State and Regional Water Quality Control Boards on potential effects of proposed solid waste discharges on ground and surface waters, based upon soil characteristics of site under investigation. Water Code, Section 229, 12922. (\$74) (\$95) (\$102)		

State Agency	Land Use	Water Resources	Air Resources	Solid Waste Management	Noise Abatement	General
Reclamation Board	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Administers the Cobey-Alquist Flood Plain Management Act within the area of the Board's jurisdiction. Water Code, Section 8400 through 8415.</li> <li>2. Provides and preserves flood protection for lands within the Sacramento and San Joaquin River basins. Water Code, Section 8526 and Sections 12648 through 12658.</li> <li>3. Owns about 20,000 acres of land in fee and about 183,000 acres in easement. Water Code, Section 8590.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Exerts control over any work or usage of streams in Central Valley, if such usage has an impact on flood control projects or plans. Water Code, Section 8700 through 8723.</li> </ol>				
State Lands Commission	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Administers and controls over 4½ million acres of public lands owned by the State, including school lands, tidelands, submerged lands, swamp and overflowed lands, and beds of navigable rivers and lakes. Such management involves the issuance of mineral leases (including oil and gas), surface leases, sales, salvage and other permits, and use planning. Reviews and acts on public problems such as beach erosion and access to tidelands. Public Resources Code, Section 6301, 6321. (\$1,575) (\$1,854) (\$1,652)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Aids in protecting water resources from contamination by reviewing the plans of proposed oil recovery installations prior to placement on state-owned submerged lands. Public Resources Code, Section 6301, 6826, 6828, and Division 3, Title 2, State Administrative Code, Section 2122.</li> <li>2. Insures that Water Quality Control Board criteria are incorporated in leases. Public Resources Code, Section 6301.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has power to limit air pollution in leasing lands. Public Resources Code, Section 6301.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No specific statutory authority, but the Commission issues pipeline easements for sewer outfalls, etc., as part of its land management function. Public Resources Code, Section 6301.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has power to prevent noisy operations when issuing leases. Public Resources Code, Section 6301, 6873.2; Administrative Code, Section 2122.</li> </ol>	
State Water Resources Control Board		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Regulates the use of all surface water (except for riparian and pre-1914 rights) and conditions water rights to achieve water quality goals. Water Code, Section 174. (\$228) (\$251) (\$254)</li> <li>2. Adopts statewide policy for water quality control. Water Code, Section 13440-13147.</li> <li>3. Reviews state and federal project reports to insure that they are not detrimental to water quality and existing Rights. Water Code, Section 1242.5-1258. (\$574) (\$651) (\$680)</li> <li>4. Reviews actions of regional boards in establishment and enforcement of requirements.</li> <li>5. Coordinates and reviews all water quality plans, data gathering and planning investigations of state agencies. Water Code, Section 13163-13166. (\$524) (\$535) (\$769)</li> <li>6. Administers state and federal grant programs for water quality control facilities and coordinates planning grants. Water Code, Section 13160. (\$132) (\$160) (\$199)</li> <li>7. Provides administration and policy and together with nine regional water quality control boards: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Develops comprehensive water quality management plans for all water basins in the State.</li> <li>b. Establishes and enforces waste discharge requirements to protect water from degradation due to liquid and solid waste, land construction practices, drainage and agricultural uses.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>				

State Agency	Land Use	Water Resources	Air Resources	Solid Waste Management	Noise Abatement	General
State Water Resources Control Board (Continued)	c. Administers pollution cleanup and abatement program. d. Establishes water reclamation requirements, water well standards and houseboat regulations. Water Code, Section 13267-13320, 13260-13267, 13523, 13801-13806, 13900-13908. (\$802) (\$924) (\$1,008) 8. Certifies all projects requiring federal permit as to compliance with water quality policies and criteria. Also certifies pollution facilities for federal tax purposes.					
<b>INDEPENDENT STATE AGENCIES</b>						
Department of Education						1. Developing the report of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Conservation Education. 2. Working with school districts, county offices, and other educational units in developing and implementing conservation education programs. 3. Working with various public agencies, citizens' groups, and private industry to secure their support and cooperation for conservation education activities.
Office of Attorney General	1. As Attorney for the people, the office is involved in the public's right to access to particular public areas. (Common Law Powers) 2. Title litigation involving lands of various bays and collection of evidence of environmental consequences regarding bay fill is under way. Government Code, Section 12500 et seq.	1. Counsel to state agencies on water matters. (In particular State Water Resources Control Board, regional boards and Department of Public Health.) Government Code, Section 12500 et seq. 2. As Attorney for the people of the State of California, may take actions regarding the people's rights and interests which relate to the environment. (Common Law Powers)	1. Counsel to state agencies on air resources matters. (In particular, Department of Public Health and Air Resources Board.) Government Code, Section 12500 et seq. 2. See 2 under Water Resources.		1. Enjoin conditions of noise constituting a public nuisance. (Common Law Powers)	
Public Utilities Commission	1. Commission supervises construction of existing and new highway-railroad grade crossings permitting new land uses. Public Utilities Code, Section 1201 et seq. 2. Asserts jurisdiction of electric plant sites, electric power line routes and gas transmission systems and issues certificates of public convenience and necessity for new water, gas, electric and communications utilities. Public Utilities Code, Section 762. (\$900) (\$1,020) (\$1,025) 3. Grants or denies certificates for air, highway, or other transportation services. 4. Orders conversion of overhead electric and communications utility lines to underground. Public Utilities Code, Section 768. 5. Issues rules governing installation of undergrounding electric and communication lines and facilities.	1. Commission has jurisdiction to require: construction, maintenance and operation of any plant or system of water, gas, electric communication public utilities and transportation companies in such a manner as to promote the health and safety of employees, customers and the public. Public Utilities Code, Section 701, 768. (\$135) (\$163) (\$163) 2. Grants or denies certificates of public convenience and necessity for new water systems and may condition such certificates to promote environmental quality. Public Utilities Code, Section 768. 3. Issues General Orders governing safety, service construction, operation and maintenance of gas, electric, water and	1. Commission has taken an active role before the Federal Power Commission to assure adequate quantities of natural gas to improve air quality. 2. Commission has recognized the additional expenses of low sulphur fuel oil supplies for electric power generation to reduce air pollution. Asserts jurisdiction over electric plant sites, electric power line routings and gas transmission systems. (\$10) (\$10) (\$10)		1. Takes corrective action on noise emission by railroad operations and bus lines. Public Utilities Code, Section 768.	

State Agency	Land Use	Water Resources	Air Resources	Solid Waste Management	Noise Abatement	General
Public Utilities Commission (Continued)		communication systems. Public Utilities Code, Section 768. 4. Orders extension rules for gas, electric, water and communications systems.				
University of California	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Collects information on soil and vegetation types; develops soil and plant-climate maps; maintains ecologically undisturbed areas in U.C. Natural Land and Water Reserves System.</li> <li>2. Conducts problem-solving research on: Land-use planning; park planning and management; recreational and wildlands conservation, development, and management; environmental horticulture, landscaping and design; watershed management; land resources evaluation; agricultural production practices in relation to land resources; environmental toxicology and pesticide residues; ecology and geology of land areas -- alpine, forest, desert and other wildlands, coastline, etc.</li> <li>3. Extends the information derived from research through a public education program that includes advice and counsel to local governmental officials.</li> <li>4. Makes recommendations on pest control to protect public health and environment; provides information (pesticide residue data, etc.) on which environmental quality standards can be based.</li> <li>5. Trains specialists in disciplines related to above activities.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Collects information on environmental aspects of water resources, such as quality of ground water.</li> <li>2. Conducts problem-solving research on: Water quality factors such as organic wastes, salts, nitrates, pesticides, and trace elements in surface and ground waters; eutrophication; drainage; waste water and sewage treatment; aquatic life in relation to pollution and other environmental changes; watershed management; estuarine and marine pollution problems; marine resources and oceanography; sea water and brackish water demineralization; public health aspects of water supply, urban amenities involving water.</li> <li>3. Extends the information derived from research through a public education program that includes advice and counsel to local governmental officials.</li> <li>4. Provides data and expertise to Water Resources Control Board and other regulatory agencies.</li> <li>5. Trains specialists in disciplines relating to the above activities.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Collects information on environmental aspects of air resources.</li> <li>2. Conducts problem-solving research on: Auto engine development; effects of smog on human and animal health, and plants; models simulating atmospheric pollution and its effects; power-generating; industrial and agricultural sources; instrumentation development, effects of air pollution on solar radiation and other aspects of the environment; microclimates, inversion layers and other meteorological aspects of air pollution; psychological, sociological, legal, economic and political aspects of air pollution.</li> <li>3. Extends the information derived from research through a public education program that includes advice and counsel to local governmental officials.</li> <li>4. Provides data to Air Resources Board and other regulatory agencies on which quality standards can be based.</li> <li>5. Trains specialists in disciplines relating to above activities.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Conducts problem-solving research on: Waste disposal and management; incineration of industrial and urban solid wastes; management and disposal of agricultural solid wastes; new waste disposal processes.</li> <li>2. Trains specialists in disciplines related to above activities.</li> <li>3. Extends the information derived from research through a public education program that includes advice and counsel to local governmental officials.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Conducts problem-solving research on certain aspects of noise abatement.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Legislature has found and declared that the University of California is the primary state-supported academic agency for research. Education Code, Section 22550.</li> </ol>

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE  
Office of Planning and  
Research

The Office serves the Governor and his cabinet as staff for long-range planning and research. In this capacity the Office has been directed to:

1. Assist in the formulation, evaluation and updating of long-range goals and policies for land use, population growth and distribution, urban expansion, open space, resources preservation and utilization, and other factors which shape statewide development patterns and significantly influence the quality of the State's environment.
2. Assist in the orderly preparation by appropriate state departments and agencies of intermediate and short-range functional plans to guide programs of transportation, water development, open space, recreation and other functions which relate to the protection and enhancement of the State's environment.
3. Regularly evaluate plans and programs of departments and agencies of State Government, identify conflicts or omissions, and recommend new state policies, programs and actions required to resolve conflicts, advance statewide environmental goals and to respond to emerging environmental problems and opportunities.
4. Assist the Department of Finance in preparing, as part of the annual state budget, an integrated program of priority actions to implement state functional plans and to achieve statewide environmental goals and objectives and take other actions to assure that the program budget, submitted annually to the Legislature, contains information reporting the achievement of state goals and objectives by departments and agencies of State Government.

5. Coordinate the development and operation of a statewide environmental monitoring system to assess the implications of growth and development trends on the environment and to identify at an early time, potential threats to public health, natural resources and environmental quality.
  6. Coordinate, in conjunction with appropriate state, regional, and local agencies, the development of objectives, criteria and procedures for the orderly evaluation and report of the impact of public and private actions on the environmental quality of the State.
  7. Coordinate research activities of State Government directed to the growth and development of the State and the preservation of environmental quality.
  8. Assist the Governor in the preparation of Environmental Goals and Policy reports which shall include:
    - a. An overview, looking 20 to 30 years ahead, of state growth and development and a statement of approved state environmental goals and objectives, including those directed to land use, population growth and distribution, urban expansion and the conservation of natural resources.
    - b. Description of new and revised state policies, programs and other actions of the Executive and Legislative branches required to implement statewide environmental goals, including intermediate-range plans and actions directed to natural resources, human resources and transportation. Government Code 65025 et seq.
- (\$188) (\$234) (\$163)

