

REVIEW OF ESTIMATED 1972-73
FISCAL YEAR REDUCTION AND
EXPENDITURES THROUGH PROPOSED
CLOSURE OF CALIFORNIA
CONSERVATION CENTER AT SUSANVILLE

Joint Legislative Audit Committee

GOVERNMENT CODE: SECTIONS 10500-10504

California Legislature

ASSEMBLYMEN

CHAIRMAN
VINCENT THOMAS
SIXTY-EIGHTH DISTRICT
MIKE CULLEN
FORTY-FOURTH DISTRICT
RAY E. JOHNSON
FOURTH DISTRICT

SENATORS

VICE CHAIRMAN
WILLIAM E. COOMBS
TWENTIETH DISTRICT
GEORGE DEUKMEJIAN
THIRTY-SEVENTH DISTRICT
GEORGE N. ZENOVICH
SIXTEENTH DISTRICT

VINCENT THOMAS
CHAIRMAN

ROOM 4126, STATE CAPITOL
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814
(916) 445-7906

WALTER J. QUINN, C.P.A., COORDINATOR
(916) 445-1890

BILL PETTITE, CONSULTANT
(916) 445-7906

EVE OSTOJA, COMMITTEE SECRETARY
(916) 445-7908

May 4, 1973

Assemblywoman Pauline Davis
Room 4148, State Capitol
Sacramento, California 95814


Dear Pauline:

Attached is the report you requested on the calculation of the \$608,832, 1972-73 fiscal year "savings" proposed by the Department of Corrections as being achievable through the closure of the California Conservation Center at Susanville.

The savings are expected to be realized from an unspecified system-wide reduction in personnel during the hiring freeze.

With my warm best wishes,

Sincerely,



VINCENT THOMAS, Chairman
Joint Legislative Audit Committee

REVIEW OF ESTIMATED 1972-73 FISCAL YEAR REDUCTION
AND EXPENDITURES THROUGH PROPOSED CLOSURE OF
CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CENTER AT SUSANVILLE

The Health and Welfare Agency has represented that \$608,832 would have been saved during fiscal year 1972-73 through the planned closure of the correctional facility at Susanville.

Assemblywoman Pauline Davis has asked:

1. Whether in our opinion the calculation of this \$608,832 is reasonable and accurate.
2. Whether the \$608,832 "saved" at Susanville will be offset by increased expenditures elsewhere necessitated by the Susanville closure.

In our opinion, the \$608,832 is a reasonable estimate of the 1972-73 fiscal year reduction in expenditures at the Susanville facility that could have accrued if the facility had been closed by the Department of Corrections assuming the closure were handled in the manner in which the Department had represented it had planned to handle it.

The Department of Corrections proposed to achieve the Susanville "savings" by transferring Susanville prisoners to other facilities, placing a freeze on hiring of new personnel, and transferring Susanville employees to other institutions. The \$608,832

estimated reduction in expenditures is net of an estimated \$300,000 in moving expenses for transferred employees. The savings are expected to be realized from an unspecified system-wide reduction in personnel during the hiring freeze.

The estimated 1972-73 \$608,832 reduction in expenditures from the proposed hiring freeze associated with the proposed closing of Susanville is only one half of one percent of the 1972-73 support appropriation for the Department of Corrections. Because of the small amount involved, there is no reason to believe that the estimated savings through this proposed hiring freeze need be offset through higher costs elsewhere in the correctional system. It is also clear, however, that one time savings of the magnitude of one half of one percent of the department's support budget could be achieved administratively whether or not the Susanville facility were closed.



Walter J. Quinn
Acting Deputy Auditor General

April 5, 1973

Staff:
R. Porter