

ORANGE COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT EXPENDITURES
AS REPORTED IN STATISTICAL REPORTS

	1934-35	1935-36	1936-37	1937-38	1938-39	1939-40	1940-41	1941-42	1942-43
Engineer in Charge	2,940.00	2,451.99	2,695.00	3,780.00	2,072.59	2,200.00	2,100.00	2,015.64	1,210.7
Assistant Engineers	4,310.00	1,731.89	1,897.37	3,080.90	238.59	799.35	2,010.11	1,827.12	62.4
Consulting Engineers, Appraisers, etc.	14,929.75	8,249.17	15,759.66	2,224.75	105.00	395.45		250.00	6,364.3
Other salaries, wages, Comp. Ins., etc.		7,935.85	11,775.33	22,725.37	10,268.68	8,512.60	11,346.55	15,172.94	657.0
Office Expense - Tele. & Tel., etc.	443.75	967.48	1,180.34	5,379.69	2,518.00	2,234.02	2,851.75	3,431.61	1,434.9
Automobiles, mileage - (Transp.)	1,313.77	3,533.49	2,972.62	5,495.87	5,999.67	4,839.28	4,674.50	6,186.26	1,723.8
Surveys, reports, findings, etc.	2,117.31	998.32	2,315.26	4,245.16	367.70	997.20	4,246.62	3,859.76	290.9
Other field expenses and stock	92.53	741.43	744.48	10,248.31	22,383.09	3,522.58	4,152.91	6,294.62	24,081.7
Unidentified Storm Drains and Constr.	17,592.84	549.09	862.96		235.99	901.49	1,106.43	939.56	
Elections and preparations		8,841.82	1,766.87	8,242.37					
Refunds		17,542.00		less	10,604.63	cr.			
Condemnation and R/W - Costs		24,355.48		4,457.50	7,410.12	1,265.00			
Santa Ana River Protection					417,228.75	67,673.70	20,568.07	142,514.37	1,926.0
Storm Damages					4,247.51				
San Juan					21,041.58	7,498.87	1,006.85	5,791.40	
P.W.A. and W.P.A. Projects		113,484.84	29,000.00						
Anaheim Storm Drain. (West)		6,088.16	434.18	3,400.00	2,088.50	8,294.27	2,763.76	1,765.23	
Villa Park " "		7,983.39		665.74	100.06	62.82	128.11	82.18	
East Richfield Tr. 925		1,114.77	672.35	18,992.31	2,171.53	262.13	1,683.26	1,147.55	
La Veta Ave. Storm Drain		1,298.96	53.86	63.68	22.49	58.38	97.91	236.69	
Costa Mesa " "		452.94		303.14	67.54	66.46	143.91	12,307.48	
Flacencia Ave. " "		583.09	66.91	1,985.13	432.37	108.55	200.78	562.48	
Alameda St. " "		409.73	959.76	16,600.95	135.44	46.24	95.25	132.16	
West 17th St. " "		79.54	145.98	4,339.32					
Harbor Dam " "		5,564.40			46.91	4.21	1,202.39	1,831.83	
Santa Ana " "			59.50						
Brea Creek " "			1,477.88	1,287.47	2,485.62	2,579.53	2,913.22	1,065.79	
Walnut Ave. " "			269.20	305.80	139.94	30.53	37.36	210.30	
Lane Road " "							2,618.05		
Center St. & Mesa Dr. - Storm Drain			8,415.71	1,412.27					
Orchard Ave. " "			1,698.19						
Katella " "			91.92	20,796.80	268.16	327.76	156.49	10.65	
Laguna Canon " "			1,689.88	1,177.99	73.12		1,006.85	245.61	
Garden Grove " "				8.00	12.12	13.44	14.50	41.04	
Irvine Ave. & Bryant St.					5,454.56	1,982.73	804.23	1,180.36	
Trabuca		?	?	?	5,374.25	695.89	340.21	171.26	
Carbon Canyon					4,107.63	?	?	?	
Tustin				11,168.53	188.64		42.19		
Coyote				1,164.29	485.53	25,484.31	14,639.83	4,514.55	
Santiago Creek					2,676.81				
Transfer to Bond Redemption - All Income						41,986.78			
Ajacherna St.						791.69			

<u>1943-1944</u>	<u>1944-1945</u>	<u>1945-1946</u>	<u>1946-1947</u>	<u>1947-1948</u>	<u>1948-1949</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1,750.00	2,600.00	3,000.00	4,759.46	6,330.00	6,538.27	46,443.66
3,685.00	4,295.00	4,420.00	4,160.00	4,475.00	4,500.00	41,430.33
	4,801.60		1,229.43	1,384.79	642.64	50,034.66
9,327.43	12,647.63	16,883.21	22,953.92	27,872.10	33,269.70	217,035.66
734.12	886.15	1,074.82	1,038.61	1,960.29	1,165.14	26,522.85
1,763.96	1,795.20	2,704.28	5,913.61	3,307.61	5,169.51	57,104.60
15,979.65	17,651.56	22,827.03	19,195.93	22,916.19	22,346.12	157,300.16
252.03	1,254.27	1,322.15	2,001.67	19,130.31	3,193.17	75,624.51
18,565.20	24,726.87	37,190.39	51,287.32	68,012.92	76,841.03	322,893.79
						18,851.06
838.00	7,459.27	15,075.38	2,339.51	3,790.07	2,724.10	6,988.21
						69,714.43
84.98		1,985.25	38,950.06			4,247.51
						690,931.18
						35,338.70
						142,484.84
						24,834.10
						9,022.30
						26,043.90
						1,831.97
						13,341.47
						3,919.31
						18,379.53
						4,564.84
						8,649.74
						59.50
					1,766.38	13,575.89
						993.13
						2,618.05
						9,827.98
						1,698.18
						21,651.78
						4,193.45
						89.10
						9,421.88
						6,581.61
						4,107.63
						11,399.36
						46,288.51
						2,676.81
						41,986.78
						791.69

1943-1944
 2671.00
 20%
 71,496.43
 3671
 71,496.43
 19,851.06
 6,988.21
 97,335.7
 2071

+ 2.65% - 4951
 10
 4

ORANGE COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT EXPENDITURES
AS REPORTED IN STATISTICAL REPORTS

	<u>1934-35</u>	<u>1935-36</u>	<u>1936-37</u>	<u>1937-38</u>	<u>1938-39</u>	<u>1939-40</u>	<u>1940-41</u>	<u>1941-42</u>	<u>1942-</u>
Dikes, Channels & Debris Work									
1938 Flood Damage				103,089.76					
Fullerton Relief Channel - Repair								10,261.88	
" Western Ave.								87.60	
Rock Plant Road Prot. - Trabuca Cr.								9,384.76	
Oso Creek Protection								2,161.00	
La Habra Storm Dr.								643.27	
South Tustin Storm Dr.								703.34	
Flower St. & Delhi Storm Dr.								556.31	
Peter's Canyon Storm Dr.								390.40	
Reimbursable Expense									
Unallocated Projects & Post War Plans									
Preliminary Plans & Survey				239.07					
Richey Street				320.04					
Newbert Prot				1,279.19					
Richfield Drain.				7,332.00					
Reimbursement to other Funds									
Prado Infiltration Project									
Santa Ana Delhi Dr. Canal									
	<u>43,739.95</u>	<u>214,957.83</u>	<u>87,005.21</u>	<u>265,811.40</u>	<u>509,823.86</u>	<u>183,635.26</u>	<u>82,952.09</u>	<u>237,977.00</u>	

Note Receipts	3,897,661.77
Spent	2,671,618.40
Difference	1,226,043.37
Bal. on Hand	970,839.00
Spent for	
Bonds & Int.	255,204.37

<u>1942-43</u>	<u>1943-44</u>	<u>1944-45</u>	<u>1945-46</u>	<u>1946-47</u>	<u>1947-48</u>	<u>1948-49</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
							103,089.76
							10,261.88
							87.60
							9,384.76
							2,161.00
	31.22						674.49
							703.34
							556.31
							390.40
971.66							2,349.17
	1,377.51				4,778.98		13,315.36
	8,536.38				5,912.75		28,113.55
			6,837.69			15,363.11	239.07
							320.04
							1,279.19
					40,000.00		47,332.00
					169,981.76		169,997.95
						16.19	29,860.74
						29,860.74	29,860.74
54,216.18	62,923.48	78,117.55	106,482.51	160,667.21	379,852.77	203,396.10	2,671,558.40

FLOOD CONTROL CONSTRUCTION) Not Accounted for as Orange Count
) Flood Control Dist. - Paid from
) State, National and Dist. Funds

	<u>1935-36</u>	<u>1936-37</u>	<u>1937-38</u>	<u>1938-39</u>	<u>1939-40</u>	<u>1940-41</u>	<u>1941-42</u>
Villa Park Storm Drain.	24,723.78	.95					
Anaheim " "	114,964.61	48,427.39					
Vets " "	5,859.48	47,877.52					
Costa Mesa " "	4,973.29						
Placentia Ave. " "	4,686.23	4,379.34	1,189.98				
West 17th St. " "	531.00	6,100.00					
Comrade St. " "		6,345.38	7,103.06				
Misc. Supplies, Etc.		80.50					
Purchase Department			25,300.00				
Grado Dam				1,499,292.93	307,587.42	350,495.50	15,951.85
Mullerton Relief Channel				1,189.17	33,812.29	220,783.64	53,714.31
Carbon Relief Channel					144.65	164.23	

Fed. + State

ORANGE COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT
REPORT OF TAXES ASSESSED

Anaheim Tax Rate

	<u>1934-35</u>	<u>1935-36</u>	<u>1936-37</u>	<u>1937-38</u>	<u>1938-39</u>	<u>1939-40</u>	<u>1940-41</u>	<u>1941-42</u>	
	.05	.10	.10	.10	.22	.2071	.10	.10	
Brea	3,032.75	8,870.10	8,778.25	9,168.14	19,140.48	18,822.64	8,936.57	8,964.51	
Fullerton	454.29	1,428.04	1,394.86	1,397.09	3,094.41	3,000.67	1,464.55	1,503.27	
Huntington Beach	4,443.20	13,652.18	13,779.17	14,064.46	32,430.17	31,252.12	14,749.75	14,390.52	
Laguna Beach	4,798.97	15,775.24	14,320.18	14,079.80	29,430.83	24,745.79	10,650.77	9,309.60	
La Habra	1,323.38	3,912.16	4,072.25	4,546.76	10,948.96	11,589.88	5,736.68	6,052.22	
Newport Beach	350.52	1,064.35	1,050.34	1,053.37	2,341.39	2,123.00	1,042.40	1,086.44	
Orange	2,584.46	7,481.26	7,694.26	8,547.71	19,900.10	19,531.20	9,726.76	10,473.76	
Placentia	2,158.70	6,304.33	6,281.33	6,215.84	13,769.51	13,077.64	6,272.15	6,322.11	
San Clemente	166.67	509.05	540.81	586.57	1,280.99	1,274.40	620.96	630.57	
Santa Ana	602.66	1,885.97	1,607.53	1,606.14	3,609.32	3,346.92	1,588.58	1,617.04	
Seal Beach	7,984.40	23,934.29	24,017.94	24,309.10	53,786.40	50,040.06	24,651.97	25,214.84	
Tustin	753.52	5,336.89	5,176.61	4,890.68	10,607.03	9,785.43	4,935.67	5,060.50	
	222.68	663.35	647.39	659.14	1,479.19	1,388.61	673.28	686.22	
Cities Totals	28,876.20	90,817.21	89,360.92	91,124.80	201,818.78	189,978.36	91,050.09	91,311.37	
County Outside	34,066.27	101,145.42	97,319.28	98,550.15	220,771.06	213,092.04	101,319.66	101,108.73	
TOTALS	62,942.47	191,962.63	186,680.20	189,674.95	422,589.84	403,070.40	192,369.75	192,420.10	

	<u>1943-44</u>	<u>1944-45</u>	<u>1945-46</u>	<u>1946-47</u>	<u>1947-48</u>	<u>1948-49</u>	<u>Sub-totals</u>	<u>1949-50</u>	<u>1950-51</u>	<u>1951-52</u>	<u>Totals</u>
	.08	.10	.10	.10	.1480	.1350		.1177	.10	.1568	
1.48	7,073.52	9,142.55	10,103.35	10,946.84	20,968.41	24,659.12	176,428.71	22,088.40	19,664.25	36,503.84	254,685.20
0.35	1,165.51	1,628.84	1,892.93	2,039.21	3,879.68	4,375.13	29,988.93	3,964.15	3,384.82	6,499.73	43,837.63
5.29	13,053.59	17,655.27	18,794.78	19,304.46	37,850.77	45,672.14	304,387.67	40,538.74	32,144.10	52,259.30	432,329.81
5.84	7,896.36	10,911.32	17,337.54	17,839.56	31,933.19	37,411.30	254,866.15	43,129.56	32,506.66	55,608.19	386,110.56
4.87	5,096.46	6,175.40	7,238.67	7,637.02	17,872.05	19,947.97	117,834.73	18,243.24	16,125.55	26,735.75	178,939.27
11.46	804.15	1,034.37	1,114.34	1,300.91	2,593.19	3,197.05	21,066.90	3,270.14	3,467.40	6,712.34	34,516.78
98.43	9,175.88	11,482.86	13,522.19	14,540.64	37,560.94	43,978.38	226,498.83	41,470.52	36,563.54	62,114.88	365,647.77
82.63	4,815.49	6,210.15	6,743.87	6,863.65	12,461.95	14,317.68	117,197.42	13,109.08	11,806.97	19,044.92	161,158.39
41.34	485.87	613.69	694.35	727.20	1,331.82	1,535.86	11,540.15	1,335.21	1,185.95	1,980.02	16,041.33
90.25	1,341.78	1,645.04	1,863.04	1,974.62	4,893.40	5,448.40	34,520.69	5,330.33	4,999.56	8,874.08	53,724.66
78.21	20,142.19	26,174.41	28,114.57	30,262.33	59,780.68	68,722.14	490,013.53	62,376.82	54,593.35	92,954.96	699,938.66
67.68	4,126.12	4,927.68	5,214.29	5,347.17	8,240.47	10,539.08	89,548.82	9,542.50	8,267.44	12,944.48	120,307.24
505.09	510.48	661.08	708.15	772.84	1,438.42	1,776.65	12,892.57	1,502.68	1,264.81	2,096.50	17,756.56
212.92	75,687.40	98,262.66	113,342.07	119,556.45	240,804.97	281,580.90	1,886,785.10	265,901.37	225,974.40	386,332.99	2,764,993.86
296.63	86,503.94	113,569.56	121,837.29	125,301.18	238,939.43	264,456.03	2,010,876.67	250,983.05	211,148.70	337,321.30	2,812,329.72
109.55	162,191.34	211,832.22	235,179.36	244,857.63	479,744.40	546,036.93	3,897,661.77	516,884.42	437,123.10	725,654.29	5,577,323.58

47
✓ 85.00

PETITION

TO: THE HONORABLE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COURTHOUSE
SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA

THE UNDERSIGNED, BEING ALL RESIDENTS OF THE CITY OF BREA OR ITS CLOSELY SURROUNDING AREA, FEELING THAT FLOOD CONTROL IS NECESSARY WITHIN BREA AND THIS AREA, AND THAT LITTLE, IF ANY, FLOOD CONTROL FUNDS HERETOFORE RAISED HAVE BEEN EXPENDED IN THIS AREA, THAT UNLESS WORK IS DONE IN CONNECTION WITH THE FLOOD CONTROL IN THE AREA THAT BREA CITY PARK AND OTHER IMPROVEMENTS WITHIN THE TOWN ARE LIKELY TO BE JEOPARDIZED BY FLOOD WATER.

DATED: MAY ____, 1953.

Melvin A. Fuller	523 So Poplar Brea
Vivian Fuller	523 S. Poplar Brea
M. K. Lashley	443 S. Walnut, Brea
Mrs. M. K. Lashley	443 So Walnut Brea
J. A. Vertson	410 W. Imperial Brea
Marie S. Vertson	410 W Imperial Brea,
Harold E. Carver	512 Union Place Brea
Jean F. Carver	512 Union Place Brea
Paul Tudor	307 E. Locust St Brea
Anna Mae Tudor	307 E Locust St. Brea
Ludrey Pulenichel	532 So Walnut. Brea
John Dougherty	445 So. Poplar, Brea
Frank J. Schwitzer	1019 E Elm St Brea.
Frank Ball	446 Maple Brea
Frank S. Hopkins	907 E Elm Brea
Helma M. Hopkins	907 E Elm Brea
Charles C. Robinson	321 So Laurel, Brea
Francis M. Robinson	321 S. Laurel, Brea.
Helma M. Schwartz	1013 E Elm, Brea
C. J. Schwartz	1013 E Elm, Brea.

PETITION

TO: THE HONORABLE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COURTHOUSE
SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA

THE UNDERSIGNED, BEING ALL RESIDENTS OF THE CITY OF BREA OR ITS CLOSELY SURROUNDING AREA, FEELING THAT FLOOD CONTROL IS NECESSARY WITHIN BREA AND THIS AREA, AND THAT LITTLE, IF ANY, FLOOD CONTROL FUNDS HERETOFORE RAISED HAVE BEEN EXPENDED IN THIS AREA, THAT UNLESS WORK IS DONE IN CONNECTION WITH THE FLOOD CONTROL IN THE AREA THAT BREA CITY PARK AND OTHER IMPROVEMENTS WITHIN THE TOWN ARE LIKELY TO BE JEOPARDIZED BY FLOOD WATER.

DATED: MAY 29, 1953.

James S. Keller
Chas. B. McLean

416 Magnolia Ave., Brea
410 E Imperial

PETITION

TO: THE HONORABLE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COURTHOUSE
SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA

THE UNDERSIGNED, BEING ALL RESIDENTS OF THE CITY OF BREA OR ITS CLOSELY SURROUNDING AREA, FEELING THAT FLOOD CONTROL IS NECESSARY WITHIN BREA AND THIS AREA, AND THAT LITTLE, IF ANY, FLOOD CONTROL FUNDS HERETOFORE RAISED HAVE BEEN EXPENDED IN THIS AREA, THAT UNLESS WORK IS DONE IN CONNECTION WITH THE FLOOD CONTROL IN THE AREA THAT BREA CITY PARK AND OTHER IMPROVEMENTS WITHIN THE TOWN ARE LIKELY TO BE JEOPARDIZED BY FLOOD WATER.

DATED: MAY _____, 1953.

Two columns of horizontal lines for signatures and names.

SUGGESTS FLOOD CONTROL SYSTEM FOR BREA CREEK

New York
Oct 10
Bastanchury Ranch Company Outlines
Lake Creation to Aid in
Protecting City

Possibility of a development which might mean much to Fullerton in the way of property protection and additional beauty is revealed in the flood control system which was suggested to the city council of Fullerton at its last meeting by Gaston A. Bastanchury, president of the Bastanchury Ranch company. This is the construction of a dam in the Brea Canyon creek which comes down through the ranch property, meeting the boulevards from Brea and La Habra at their junction, coming down east of Spadra road until just north of Chapman avenue and veers west. The cost of this is given as about \$10,000.

It is pointed out that such a dam which could be constructed about 200 feet east of the La Habra boulevard about one-half mile south of the north limits of Fullerton. In wet winters there is a large amount of water coming down this deep gully, the water rising four or five feet during heavy rains. Flood waters are a menace of property in the low lands as all old timers know and such an improvement would prevent this, it is stated. Another point brought out by the ranch company is that a lake could be formed which would offer vast possibilities to Fullerton in the way of beauty and enjoyment. The dam could be built into the shale-clay walls, it is said, to hold

any amount of water. The letter was referred to a committee by the council. Its text follows:

Gentlemen:

Many citizens residing in and around Fullerton have brought the matter of flood control of the Brea Canyon Creek to my attention and consideration. I think you are familiar with the location of the Brea Canyon Creek through the city of Fullerton, and I think you are also acquainted with the damage that it caused during rainy seasons especially when abnormal wet seasons contribute sufficient water to this creek to cause same to overflow in and around the city of Fullerton causing at times great damage. The older residents of Fullerton will remember the great damage that has been done on several occasions during the last few years. Most of the land tributary to the Brea Canyon Creek drainage systems has become highly developed and very expensive improvements placed thereon.

In order that we may use some precautions for the future it has been suggested to me by those who are familiar with damages caused in the past that it would be very advisable to install some method of control. Many prominent engineers have suggested and made recommendations for constructing a thirty foot dam or an

(Continued on page 4)

Oct. 10, 1925

Dads Club Elects Dunn President For New Term

Max Dunn was unanimously re-elected president of the Brea Dads club at the club's initial meeting of the year May 7 in the City Hall.

Other officers elected were Charles Russell, vice-president; and Clarence Schwartz, secretary-treasurer.

A board of directors was voted into office to help guide the activities of the club for the year. The board consists of Dr. John Buck, H. N. Winchel, Dayton Alexander, Jack Snell, and A. J. Roland. Another will be added later.

Bud Goodell was appointed director of the summer program which will run this year from June 23 to Aug. 30.

At the meeting Schwartz announced that he had received a check for \$50.75 from the Brea Grammar Teachers to help support the program. If any other citizens want to help the program financially and thus enlarge, they can mail or bring their donations to Oilfields bank, he said.

The Brea Dads club...

May Bring Flood Control to Park

The Grand Jury investigation into the use of funds by the County Flood Control district has brought assurance to Brea that flood control measures in the new park would be taken soon, according to Mayor Charles McCart.

McCart was one of nine Orange county mayors called to testify before the Grand Jury last Wednesday of the lack of adequate flood control in the county despite a total of \$5,577,323.58 paid in taxes to the flood control office since 1934.



MAYOR CHARLES McCART

McCart said that Thursday night following a meeting of the executive board of the Orange County League of Cities he was assured, by Willis Warner, chairman of the County Board of Supervisors and a member of the supervisory board of the flood control district, that flood control work demanded by Brea could be done without a planned appropriation.

Flood Control

The alterations the city have asked for consist of adequate storm drainage through the flood control channel bisecting Brea's new park on the west end of the city.

Warner said that the flood control engineers have been ordered to make a study of the condition, according to McCart.

The job would be taken care of out of funds on hand, McCart said he was told by Warner.

The flood control office has on hand the sum of \$1,443,400, the Grand Jury was told. Of this, \$876,000 is a cash balance and could be expended.

Warner Explains

Warner told the city officials at the League of Cities meeting Thursday that two wars and a lack of governmental priorities have held up flood control projects in the county.

The Federal government has taken over construction of a \$3 million dam in Carbon Canyon, and has not appropriated any funds because of the war in Korea.

McCart said that the chief complaint of the mayors appearing before the Grand Jury was that residents are still taxed 15 68 cents per \$100 of assessed property valuation, even though the flood control district has a huge reserve which it cannot spend.

Projects Proposed

The reason was brought out by Warner. The cost of the projects proposed dwarfs the revenue on hand he said.

The 15 projects approved for the county will cost a total of \$4,210,000.

ck
ate
write-in candidate at
what they call unequal
district board of trustees.
hen the school district
ent" that there would
representatives from Olin
ree from Brea on the
out out that Perry
is running for re-elec
board in tomorrow's
s moved to Brea since
ed to represent Olinda
ago.
him to withdraw, and
voters to write in the
Richard P. Cornell,
ector for the county
ent of Olinda.
as born in Riverside in
was graduated from
12. He joined the coast
anch of the U. S.
e he served until the
World War 2, when he
red to the Air Force.
during the war as an

out of funds on hand, McCart said he was told by Warner.

The flood control office has on hand the sum of \$1,443,400, the Grand Jury was told. Of this, \$876,000 is a cash balance and could be expended.

Warner Explains

Warner told the city officials at the League of Cities meeting Thursday that two wars and a lack of governmental priorities have held up flood control projects in the county.

The Federal government has taken over construction of a \$3 million dam in Carbon Canyon, and has not appropriated any funds because of the war in Korea.

McCart said that the chief complaint of the mayors appearing before the Grand Jury was that residents are still taxed 15 62 cents per \$100 of assessed property valuation, even though the flood control district has a huge reserve which it cannot spend.

Projects Proposed

The reason was brought out by Warner. The cost of the projects proposed dwarfs the revenue on hand, he said.

The 15 projects approved for the county will cost a total of \$4,210,000.

"Just one of these projects, the construction of a 13-mile lined channel to handle run-off from the proposed Carbon Canyon dam will cost an estimated \$1,200,000," he said.

The flood control district has operating expenses of \$36,000 per year, according to McCart.

McFadden Speaks
Supervisor Ralph McFadden, representing the Third district, which includes Brea, said this week that he is not at fault for inadequate flood control measures, even though he was called before the Grand Jury.

McFadden told the Grand Jury that he had been head of the flood control commission of the Board of

ANALYSIS OF A \$42,000,000 FLOOD CONTROL BOND ISSUE
IN ORANGE COUNTY ON THE JUNE 5TH BALLOT

AS A RESULT OF THE CONTROVERSY WHICH EXISTS IN CONNECTION WITH THE ABOVE-INDICATED BOND ISSUE, A GROUP OF CIVIC MINDED PEOPLE MET IN BREA ON MONDAY MORNING, MAY 28, 1956 TO DISCUSS THE MATTER. EVERYONE AT THE MEETING WAS IN ACCORD WITH THE FACT THAT WE DO NEED A GOOD FLOOD CONTROL PROGRAM IN ORANGE COUNTY, AND THAT WE SHOULD GET IT WITH AS LITTLE DELAY AS POSSIBLE.

THE FLOOD CONTROL PLAN WHICH WILL BE PRESENTED TO THE VOTERS ON JUNE 5, 1956 IS NOT A GOOD PLAN; AND, THEREFORE, SHOULD NOT BE SUPPORTED. THE PLAN FOR DRAINAGE AND FLOOD CONTROL FACILITIES FOR ORANGE COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT SHOULD NOT BE SUPPORTED FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

1. THE PLAN DOES NOT SET OUT SPECIFICALLY WHAT WORK IS TO BE DONE, AND DOES NOT ESTABLISH A PRIORITY RATING FOR WORK TO BE DONE; NOR DOES IT STATE ANY SPECIFIC WORK WOULD BE DONE.
2. THE PLAN DOES NOT SPECIFICALLY ALLOCATE PROJECTS AND AMOUNTS OF MONEY FOR THE NUMEROUS INDIVIDUAL SEGMENTS OF THE ALL-OVER PLAN.
3. THE \$42,620,000 ESTIMATED AMOUNT WILL PROBABLY BE LESS THAN ONE-HALF THE ACTUAL AMOUNT NEEDED TO PROVIDE A GOOD FLOOD CONTROL PROGRAM FOR ORANGE COUNTY.
4. THE PLAN IS NOT INTEGRATED WITH A PROGRAM FOR WATER CONSERVATION. THIS IS A VERY SERIOUS DEFICIENCY IN THE FLOOD CONTROL PLAN.
5. THE PROPOSED MAXIMUM TAX LEVY OF 25 CENTS PER \$100 OF ASSESSED VALUATION, IS NOT AN EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION TO THE TAXPAYERS OF ORANGE COUNTY. A WIDE VARIANCE IN THE DEGREE OF BENEFITS FROM SUCH A PLAN WOULD EXIST BETWEEN THE VARIOUS SECTIONS OF ORANGE COUNTY. THE TAX BURDEN SHOULD BE CLOSER TO THE RELATIONSHIP OF FLOOD CONTROL BENEFITS FOR EACH AREA IN THE COUNTY.
6. THE CITY OF BREA HAS COLLECTED FROM ITS TAXPAYERS, AND DEPOSITED WITH THE COUNTY TREASURE OVER THE LAST SEVERAL YEARS, TENS OF THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS BUT NO FLOOD CONTROL WORK HAS BEEN DONE IN THE BREA AREA BY THE ORANGE COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT, EVEN THOUGH REQUESTS HAVE BEEN MADE FROM TIME TO TIME.
7. OTHER CITIES, SUCH AS HUNTINGTON BEACH, HAVE HAD THE SAME EXPERIENCE AS BREA WITH REGARD TO THE LACK OF FLOOD CONTROL WORK DONE BY THE FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT.
8. THE PLAN SHOULD COVER ONLY PRINCIPAL CHANNELS, AS THE LATERAL CHANNELS SHOULD BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF EACH OF THE LOCAL AREAS.
9. IT IS A GENERALLY ACCEPTED PRINCIPAL THAT ENGINEERING MATTERS OF THIS NATURE SHOULD BE THE FINALIZED THINKING OF TWO OR MORE ENGINEERING FIRMS RATHER THAN JUST THE THINKING OF A LOCAL ORANGE COUNTY FIRM AS IN THIS CASE. THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES HAD THREE ENGINEERING FIRMS SEPARATELY DEVELOP AND COORDINATE A \$60,000,000 PROGRAM.

ANALYSIS OF A \$42,000,000 FLOOD CONTROL BOND ISSUE IN ORANGE COUNTY ON THE JUNE 5TH BALLOT

10. A PROPERLY INTEGRATED FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION PLAN WOULD PROBABLY CHANGE THE MAXIMUM LOAD REQUIREMENTS OF THE PRINCIPAL CHANNELS WHICH WOULD MEAN REDUCED COSTS OF CONSTRUCTION.
11. THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS APPARENTLY VOTED MONEY FOR ENGINEERING SURVEYS, ETC., TO BE MADE IN CONNECTION WITH THE CARSON CANYON PROJECT.
12. THE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HAS NOT ADEQUATELY PLANNED THE FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION PROGRAM IN THIS COUNTY OVER THE PAST YEARS.
13. MONEY WHICH HAS BEEN COLLECTED BY THE FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT DURING THE PAST SEVERAL YEARS HAS BEEN USED TO MAINTAIN PRESENT INADEQUATE FLOOD CONTROL CHANNELS.
14. THERE ARE NO ESTIMATES GIVEN IN THE PLAN FOR ANNUAL MAINTENANCE COSTS, WHICH UNDOUBTEDLY WOULD BE VERY HIGH BECAUSE OF THE EXTENSIVE USE OF OPEN DITCHES.
15. IT IS PROBABLE THAT LEGISLATION SHOULD BE REQUESTED IN SACRAMENTO TO HELP US WITH OUR FLOOD CONTROL PROGRAM.
16. THE ORANGE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HAVE NOT HELD THE NECESSARY COUNTY-WIDE MEETINGS TO EXPLAIN THIS PLAN. THE COUNTY-WIDE MEETINGS WOULD UNDOUBTEDLY HAVE RESULTED IN UNFAVORABLE REACTION TO THE PLAN WHICH MAY BE ONE REASON WHY MEETINGS HAVE NOT BEEN HELD. DURING THE LAST TWO YEARS THERE HAS BEEN VERY POOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE OFFICERS OF THE VARIOUS CITIES AND THE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IN CONNECTION WITH THE OBTAINING OF INFORMATION, EXPLANATIONS, ETC., REGARDING THE PLAN. VERY INADEQUATE PRESENTATIONS HAVE BEEN MADE TO THE CITIES BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.
17. AN ENGINEER'S REPORT COVERING A PROPOSAL OF THIS TYPE SHOULD INCLUDE AMONG OTHER THINGS WITH DETAILS OF ANNUAL MAINTENANCE COSTS, A PLAN FOR THE AMORTIZATION OF THE BONDS, EQUITABLE BASIS FOR TAXING EACH AREA IN THE COUNTY AND THE BENEFITS TO BE DERIVED BY EACH AREA.

OTHER WEAKNESSES IN THE PROPOSED PLAN COULD BE CITED, BUT THE ABOVE ARE SUFFICIENT TO STRONGLY RECOMMEND A NO VOTE ON THIS ISSUE ON THE JUNE 5TH BALLOT.