

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL**

**March 21, 2006
3:00 - 4:30 PM
A218C**

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Romo, J. Friedlander, P. Bishop, S. Ehrlich, L. Fairly, J. Sullivan, K. McLellan, E. Frankel, T. Garey, P. Haslund, B. Lindemann, K. Molloy, L. Auchincloss, M. Guillen

ABSENT: A. Serban

GUESTS: L. Griffin

1.0 Call to Order

1.1 Approval of the minutes of the January 24th, February 7th and February 21st CPC meetings.

Not addressed.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 John Romo will attend the first 30 minutes of this meeting.

3.0 Information Items

3.1 Staffing plan to support increase in the number of international students served by the college

John Romo joined the meeting to give an update and overview on the change in policy to be considered by the Board to expand the international student enrollment target of 525 to 5% of the total credit headcount. He said the Board had previously in a study session agreed to increase the enrollment to 600 students. Unfortunately, it did not go forward at the time to the Board as an action item. When it was determined that the number of international students allowed is in written policy, the alternative approach of using a percentage of total enrollment to determine the number at which the college would be comfortable was broached. He wanted to convey that the next steps in the possible expansion of international student enrollment will be handled carefully and in consultation primarily on the decision points of how much do we expand; those consultations taking place primarily between the administration and the Academic Senate because of the impact on the number of international students would have on

instruction. He said he would be happy to meet with any other groups who want to have input on this process.

President Romo said the second point under consideration is how we expand the International Students Program. We have to assure that we can provide support services for the international students that we accept to the college. There has been a practice that has never been in policy to say from a proportion of the funds generated by international students be designated to the program to support services. Also where appropriate, we would also use some of those funds to allow for additional classes to be offered to theoretically alleviate any impact that international students might have on classes and as a way to be able to expand the curriculum. President Romo said as we go forward with the expansion of the international student enrollment, we will look at the additional support services necessary to charge from the new revenue that the new international students would be generating. He said he will come back to CPC with the information on how much we will have to expand in the service area and what the projected revenue and net gain will be to the district.

Sue Ehrlich asked whether the resource and staffing plans for International Students adequately reflect the additional impact to the college, i.e., HR/LA, Admissions, Health Insurance, and whether the program is actually going to pay its way and will we understand the true impact to the college. John Romo said this additionally needs to be considered. Jack Friedlander said the tuition from international students goes into the General Fund to support the college as well as help sustain some of the classes that otherwise would not be able to be offered. John Romo would like to see a three-to-four year strategy for the budget impact from one year to the next to get to the optimum number to build the budget cycle over time to that number. Joe Sullivan said that we need to analyze it from that perspective of per student costs. Jack Friedlander said that without additional support, we are not going to accept as many students next year with the current staffing.

3.2 Process and criteria to be used in prioritizing the requests for additional resources

John Romo said the process that has come out of CPC is for the departmental level input into the processes. He said what the Council will have by the next meeting is a projection on what funds might be available. He said what needs to come from the Council is a priority list of resource proposals which can go forward as soon as the funding is identified. Jack Friedlander said EC will identify and present to CPC at its next meeting a list of its institutional priorities based on their unique importance or that they cross areas of the college that are not departmental but need to be given consideration. Jack Friedlander said his list of priorities for Educational Programs' new resource requests would reflect the outcomes of his consultation with the deans and the Academic Senate.

John Romo said that prior to the budget crisis in 2002-03 we had \$2.4m each year that was swept out of ending balances for equipment and construction. We went for two years at zero dollars and are now at \$1.2m and \$1.8m as a budget item for equipment

and construction. He said he might come with a recommendation from EC to augment these allocations. President Romo said that prior to the past few years, we had state money to supplement equipment and now we have no money for equipment plus costs have risen. There is a cutback of 75% in deferred maintenance allocations and the college has a long list of deferred maintenance items that are core to maintaining the college's infrastructure to which we cannot look for state funding to address.

Kathy Molloy distributed the Student Success Initiative. John Romo told the Council this will be a high priority recommendation. The Board had recommended this process to take place under the leadership of the Executive Vice President and the Academic Senate. President Romo said he was very proud of the work that has been done by the faculty, deans and Kathy Molloy and Jack Friedlander and the leadership that has been shown. The Board will receive this document for discussion at its study session in April on the programmatic directions and recommendations. John Romo said along with the allocations we will be considering from the General Fund, we will need the information to build what we want to present to the Foundation for those kinds of things that are appropriately funded from the Foundation. He said they will be embarking this spring on development of a new strategic plan for the Foundation and the substance of what that focus is going to be from the fundraising perspective is driven by the college. The input into that will be primarily out of the process of CPC in the resource needs identified across the college. He said with regard to the Student Success Initiative Partnership for Success, we may need some "bridge" money to get started and we can look to the Foundation for some of these funds.

3.3 Update on the status of the recommendation to consider building a student residence facility on campus

John Romo said he will be visiting the consultation bodies to give them an opportunity to address questions and concerns regarding the possibility of a student residence facility on campus. He clarified that the Board has approved two things to date: the first is to continue to become more creative and assertive in approaches we might use to attract out-of-area students in general. He said there are some things we already do but cautioned there are limitations to what we can do in our long-range planning in anticipation of the projected down spiral in the availability of local area students. He said the Board's highest priority is the commitment to our local students and added that this concept is practiced every day in both credit and non-credit. Secondly, the Board approved the acceptance of a recommendation of the President to proceed with continuing to look at the possibility of building a student housing facility at an on-campus or off-campus location as well as potential sites for faculty and staff housing. President Romo said there have been discussions regarding the building of student housing with one company whose representatives have visited the campus and who have given us some detailed concepts. There are other companies who have also contacted the college about its interests in working with them to construct an on-campus student residence facility. He said there has been a small fact-finding workgroup formed just to look at ideas. This first review would be to educate ourselves on the possibilities of this kind of project. If we decide to go to the next level we would

use the college's consultation process to address these issues. President Romo said that if we are going to have to rely on out-of-area students more, providing housing would be a way of attracting those students. The responsible way of approaching that in this community is to consider building our own housing. That would alleviate against issues of impacting the availability of local rental housing for non-SBCC students, transportation and traffic issues because it would discourage private ownership of cars. John Romo said that the message we deliver is that the first priority of Santa Barbara City College is to its local area.

3.4 Update on faculty hiring

Sue Ehrlich reported that to date we have hired a new dean, a librarian and a nursing faculty member. She said the names of finalists for numerous other positions have been forwarded to the President. Vice President Ehrlich said that the process is going extremely well. She said the level of participation with faculty in the departments involved in hiring new positions has begun at a much earlier date and has helped us get diverse pools of applicants. Jack Friedlander said the quality of applicants coming forward is superb. He said Alice Scharper, the dean we have hired to replace Jack Ullom, is exceptional and will be an asset to the college.

3.5 Update on projection to achieve the college's funded FTES targets for 2005-06

Jack Friedlander said that Andreea Serban calculated the college's projected FTES for this year using data from summer and fall 2005 and spring 2006 as of first census. Based on this data, it looks as if we are going to be 4.5 FTES within capturing all of our allowable growth and Basic Skills funding this year.

3.6 Status of proposal to add a summer session

Jack Friedlander said he still believes we will need two summer sessions in summer 2007 to meet the college's funded FTES target for 2006-07. He said the Council had asked for a cost benefit analysis and he began the process of identifying the costs of supporting a second summer session. He said we would need to generate a minimum amount of revenue from the second summer session. When he looked at what departments were willing to offer in the first five-week session, there would not be enough of a robust offering to generate the resources needed to support two summer sessions. Further, the administrators and staff involved in the Banner implementation project have asked him to delay offering two summer sessions for a year so that they could devote all their time to preparing for the implementation of the new Banner system. Jack Friedlander said because of these two factors, he feels it would not be responsible to go forward with a second summer session in 2007.

4.0 Discussion Items

4.1 Procedures to prioritize resource requests

- A. List of proposals that were submitted
- B. College Consultation Process for Prioritizing
- C. Timelines and process for CPC review of the resource requests

The list of proposals for resource requests were provided to the Council. Dr. Friedlander asked that the Council look over this list and let him know if anything is missing or inaccurate so that the list can be updated. He said the intent is to distribute to the Council in the next couple of days the actual proposals. Corrections to the list will be e-mailed to the Council. EC's institutional priorities will be given to the Council at the next CPC meeting as well as the priorities from the vice presidents for each of their respective divisions of the college.

4.2 Proposal to install parking meters

Joe Sullivan distributed an outline for a plan to incorporate parking meters in some of the lots and reorganize the areas where faculty, staff and students park. This will increase the short-term parking spots for visitors and for people coming to the dining areas. The Council expressed its concerns about the proposed plan, primarily whether it would deter visitors from coming to campus for events (e.g., theatre events and concerts). In response to a question about this proposal being revenue driven, Joe Sullivan responded that the revenue made will initially be used to pay for the cost of the dispensers and in the future, upkeep and maintenance on foreseeable damage to the dispensers. He said it is designed to make the parking simpler and more effective. He said when visitors come to campus; they will not have to stop at the kiosk to get a pass which presently can create traffic jams that backup onto Cliff Drive. It is also a form of regulating how many cars come on campus. Keith McLellan said that he felt the proposal was solid and the intent to mitigate the traffic backup was crucial to avoid accidents. The Council also felt it was important to allow free parking after 7:00 p.m. to allow for free parking for night events as well as for weekends and between semesters.

4.3 Other items

There were no other items.

5.0 Adjournment

Upon motion the meeting was adjourned. CPC will meet again on March 28th at a time and in a room to be determined.

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL
March 28, 2006
3:00 - 4:30 PM
P.E. Conference Room**

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Friedlander, P. Bishop, S. Ehrlich, L. Fairly, J. Sullivan, A. Serban, K. McLellan,
E. Frankel, B. Lindemann, L. Auchincloss, M. Guillen, C. Ramirez, K. Russell

ABSENT: T. Garey, P. Haslund, K. Molloy

GUEST: S. Broderick [for Molloy], P. English

1.0 Call to Order

1.1 Approval of the minutes of the January 24th, February 7th and February 21st CPC meetings.

January 24th: **M/S/C [Guillen/Fairly] unanimously**

February 7th: **M/S/C [Fairly/___] unanimously**

February 21st **M/S/C [Guillen/Auchincloss] unanimously**

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Jack Friedlander informed the Council that Ron Baker has announced his retirement effective July 31st. Dr. Friedlander said he would be meeting with John Romo to determine how best to structure Dean Baker's position once it becomes vacant within the guidelines that are currently in place for the Athletic Director position.

3.0 Information Items

There were no information items.

4.0 Discussion Items

4.1 Estimated amount of funds available for resource allocations

Joe Sullivan distributed a worksheet on the estimated amount of funds available for allocating to resource requests. He said that he took into consideration the fiscal year 05-06 to determine any ongoing dollars that can be allocated to additional resources for the coming year. The result was the balance that was in growth and equalization and the COLA for the 4000 and 5000 accounts. Using those amounts, the total dollars available for distribution from 2005-06 is approximately \$1,407,239. Mr. Sullivan said

in 2006-07, we are looking at the same amounts based on our projections. He said we are not projecting any growth for next year. Jack Friedlander said it would be too risky to count on growth for next year and doesn't want to budget for growth based on all of the factors of which we are aware. Mr. Sullivan said that if we see growth for the fall then we can make a budget adjustment. As for equalization, only half of what is in the Governor's budget was projected. COLA is being budgeted at 5.18%. John Romo is recommending that the Council rank up to \$1.5m. Joe Sullivan said that if there is any ongoing money from ending balances it will go towards those ranked items.

Liz Auchincloss asked how negotiations were going to fit into the amount of ongoing money available for next year in relation to the requests for resources that are being proposed. Sue Ehrlich said that it is difficult to come up with an exact amount and this is what our best effort is to try to come up with an amount that will be manageable and it is in no way intended to preclude the negotiations process.

A spirited discussion and differing perspectives were had by the Council, Mr. Sullivan and Jack Friedlander on the revenues generated by and expenses incurred for the International Students program.

Vice President Sullivan said that the spreadsheet will be refined and redistributed to the Council.

- 4.2 EC's list of fixed increased expenses that need to be covered from the amount of funds available to fund new resource requests.

Joe Sullivan distributed this spreadsheet and the Council discussed the items presented.

Sue Ehrlich addressed the issue of the approximately 1,500 hourly classified employees that work on campus across the course of the year. She said the pay has not been increased for this category of employees since 2002. The intent in the request for dollars is to augment the hourly accounts is to take advantage of what was learned from the classification study to try to impose some rational order to the way the hourly are paid. She said they have come up with the figure for compensating hourly classified based on the first step of the classified salary schedule (July 2005). She said hourly classified would not move across that schedule but rather a percentage of the first step depending upon what the hourly classified is going to do based on existing classified positions relating to the classification study. That is how we will determine the step in the column on which we will take a percentage to come up with an hourly rate of pay for the classified hourly. Liz Auchincloss made the point that hourly are supposed to be temporary staff and that there are hourly on campus who have been employed for years. Ms. Ehrlich said this will enable the hourly to be paid with some consistency relative to the complexity and the difficulty of the work. She said since we are not benchmarking the rates externally we therefore do not have a standard that we are trying to meet.

Liz Auchincloss expressed her concern about increasing the hourly rates while we have to give up permanent positions because we can't fund the ones that are needed and should have been funded a long time ago.

The Council had a discussion seeking understanding and clarification on the revenue and operating expenses generated by the International Student Program. Joe Sullivan said once our fiscal year 2005-06 is over, he can calculate the exact number.

The Council also discussed items that should not be part of the resource requests that could be funded by other means and/or are not appropriate to be considered for this process. Other items will need additional clarification. The spreadsheets will be modified and resent to the Council.

4.3 Vice presidents and EC's priorities to be distributed at the next CPC meeting

The Council was so informed.

4.4 Procedures and timeline for evaluating and ranking resource requests.

The vice presidents will provide their list of priorities by tomorrow so that they can be reviewed at tomorrow's Academic Senate meeting. The first hearing will be on April 18th and the ranking will take place on May 2nd.

5.0 Other Items

5.1 The next meeting of CPC is April 18th.

6.0 Adjournment

Upon motion the meeting was adjourned.



S TATE BUDGET UPDATE

JUNE 10, 2006

A status report on the actions, discussions, and rumors in Sacramento related to the community colleges' state budget for fiscal year 2006-07. This update is distributed to all chief executive officers for distribution to trustees, administrators, faculty, classified, public/governmental relations officers and student leaders.

Conference Committee Approves Historic Community College Budget

Facing Thursday's often overlooked constitutional deadline for the Legislature to send the budget to the governor, the six-member conference committee reconciling the community college budget approved a historic budget for California's community colleges today. The Legislature plans votes on the 2006-07 budget plan on Thursday, although Republican votes may be scarce and further negotiations are expected. However, the community college budget will likely be of little controversy and could be adopted as approved by the committee today.

The budget provides the largest funding augmentation (\$969 million) in the history of California's community colleges, including both large ongoing (\$690.3 million) and one-time (\$279.6 million) appropriations. Some of the significant augmentations include:

COLA and Growth

The budget would provide a 5.92% cost-of-living adjustment and 2% enrollment growth. Since about half of the districts are receiving stabilization funds in the current year equivalent to 2% of statewide workload and must restore those enrollments next year, the total funding available for growth is actually around 4%.

90th Percentile Equalization Fully Funded

The Conference Committee approved the full funding of the SB 361 90th percentile (\$159.4 million) and \$19.7 million to ease the transition for districts that would have received more funding under the 2003-04 budget's formula and calculations.

Career and College Preparation Funded at \$30 million

The new career and college preparation noncredit program would receive \$30 million to increase the per-FTES rate toward the credit rate. After the Board of Governors adopts the course and program standards, funds will be pro-rated to all eligible career and college preparation FTES.

Student Enrollment Fee Reduced to \$20/unit, Effective January 1, 2007

The plan would lower enrollment fees for community colleges to \$20/unit, effective January 1, 2007. The cost of the reduction was funded by maintaining the career technical education program (\$20 million) and ongoing scheduled maintenance and instructional equipment (\$27.3 million) at their current funding levels.

Large Block Grants to be Provided to All Districts; Mandates to be Repaid

The budget provides a \$100 million block grant to be allocated on a per-FTES basis to all districts. Additionally, two separate block grants of \$47 million each will be provided for scheduled maintenance and instructional equipment.

Additionally, the plan would provide \$15 million to begin to address the backlog of community college mandate claims, and restore an ongoing line-item for mandate repayment (\$4 million). Significant augmentations are provided for part-time faculty office hours and health insurance to meet the level of all claims filed by districts last year.

Significant Increases for Student Support Services

Inflationary (5.92%) and adult population growth (1.74%) adjustments will be provided to matriculation, basic skills, disabled students, EOPS and CARE programs. The budget further augments matriculation by \$24 million, providing critically needed counseling and assessment. Additionally, \$9.6 million would be provided for interpreter and real-time captioning services to hearing impaired and learning disabled students. These funds will be provided on a 4-to-1 state-to-local match. Further, \$9 million would be provided to augment services to students in the community college CalWORKs program.

For more detail, visit the League's budget chart at <http://www.ccleague.org/leginfo/budget/>.



Item	2005-06 Final Budget	2006-07 Governor's May Revise	2006-07 Senate Version	2006-07 Assembly Version	Conference Committee
General Apportionment					
Base Apportionment	4,624,843,000	5,021,503,000	5,021,503,000	5,021,503,000	4,997,116,000
04-05 Apportionment Veto Set-Aside for Accountability	31,409,000	<i>(folded in to base)</i>	<i>(folded in to base)</i>	<i>(folded in to base)</i>	<i>(folded in to base)</i>
Cost-of-living adjustment (categorical COLA incl. below)	198,542,000	297,273,000	297,273,000	297,273,000	297,273,000
Growth for Apportionments	136,709,000	156,258,000	107,508,000	107,508,000	94,622,000
Equalization	30,000,000	130,000,000	159,438,000	80,000,000	159,438,000
Non-credit enhancement	-	0	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000
Apportionment reduction for unused growth	-	-85,000,000	-85,000,000	-85,000,000	-85,000,000
Realignment of nursing item (technical issue)	-	-10,000,000	-10,000,000	-10,000,000	-10,000,000
Apportionment increase for remediation/exit exam	-	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Student fee reduction (to \$20 full-year)	-	-	-	80,000,000	40,000,000
Total General Apportionment	5,021,503,000	5,520,034,000	5,530,722,000	5,531,284,000	5,533,449,000
Categorical Programs					
Academic Senate for the Community Colleges	467,000	467,000	467,000	467,000	467,000
Basic Skills and Apprenticeship	43,453,000	48,339,000	48,339,000	48,339,000	48,339,000
California Virtual University	1,347,000	1,347,000	1,347,000	1,347,000	1,347,000
Career Technical Education	-	50,000,000	50,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
Child Care Tax Bailout	-	6,540,000	6,540,000	6,540,000	6,540,000
Disabled Students Programs and Services	91,191,000	107,870,000	107,870,000	107,870,000	107,870,000
Economic Development	35,790,000	46,790,000	46,790,000	46,790,000	46,790,000
EOPS & CARE	104,759,000	112,916,000	112,916,000	112,916,000	112,916,000
Equal Employment Opportunity	1,747,000	1,747,000	1,747,000	1,747,000	1,747,000
Foster Care Education Program	4,754,000	4,754,000	4,754,000	4,754,000	4,754,000
Fund for Student Success	6,158,000	6,158,000	6,158,000	6,158,000	6,158,000
Matriculation	66,332,000	95,481,000	95,481,000	95,481,000	95,481,000
Nursing	-	15,500,000	15,500,000	15,500,000	18,386,000
Part-Time Faculty Compensation	50,828,000	50,828,000	50,828,000	50,828,000	50,828,000
Part-Time Faculty Health Insurance	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
Part-Time Faculty Office Hours	7,172,000	7,172,000	7,172,000	11,172,000	11,172,000
Physical Plant and Instructional Support	27,345,000	56,876,000	54,176,000	54,176,000	27,345,000
Professional Development	-	-	-	5,000,000	-
Special Services for CalWORKs Recipients	34,580,000	34,580,000	43,580,000	43,580,000	43,580,000
Student Financial Aid Administration	48,206,000	52,593,000	52,593,000	52,593,000	52,593,000
Telecommunications and Technology Infra.	24,397,000	26,197,000	26,197,000	26,197,000	26,197,000
Transfer Education and Articulation	1,974,000	1,424,000	1,424,000	1,424,000	1,424,000
Ongoing Prop 98 Funds Subtotal	5,573,003,000	6,248,613,000	6,273,601,000	6,250,163,000	6,223,383,000
One-Time Funds (Prop. 98 Reversion & Settle-up)					
Career technical education equipment	20,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000
Mandate reimbursements	10,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
Physical Plant and Instructional Support	-	100,000,000	93,900,000	99,500,000	94,144,000
General Purpose Block Grant	-	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000
AB 1280 Rural Baccalaureate Pilot Programs	-	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Funding Formula Reform - One-time Costs	-	23,600,000	19,710,000	19,710,000	19,710,000
Student Clinical Placement Registries	-	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
Internet access for offsite centers	-	500,000	1,446,000	1,446,000	1,466,000
Professional Development	-	-	-	500,000	5,000,000
Strategic Plan Implementation	-	-	-	500,000	500,000
Nursing (faculty stipends and clinical registry)	-	-	-	-	3,000,000
Part-time Office Hours and Health Insurance	-	-	9,000,000	<i>(ongoing)</i>	<i>(ongoing)</i>
One-time Prop 98 Funds Subtotal	30,000,000	279,700,000	279,656,000	276,256,000	270,900,000
Miscellaneous (Non-program) Items					
Mandate reimbursements (suspension continues)	4,000	4,004,000	4,004,000	4,004,000	4,004,000
STRS Payments for CCC Employees	82,161,000	83,013,000	83,013,000	83,013,000	83,013,000
Compton College Loan (Non-Prop. 98)	-	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000
Lease-Purchase Bond Payments	61,512,000	63,960,000	63,960,000	63,960,000	63,960,000
Lottery	177,871,000	177,871,000	177,871,000	177,871,000	177,871,000
Total State-Determined Funding	5,924,551,000	6,887,161,000	6,912,105,000	6,885,267,000	6,853,131,000
Funded FTES	1,134,409	1,192,604	1,157,097	1,157,097	1,157,097
Prop 98 (Local) Ongoing Funding per FTES	4.913	5.239	5.422	5.402	5.378
Prop 98 (Local) One-Time Funding per FTES	26	235	242	239	234
Funding per FTES	\$ 5,223	\$ 5,775	\$ 5,974	\$ 5,950	\$ 5,923

See "Program Changes" worksheet for explanation of funding changes.

Proposed Parking Measures for Fall 06

The following is the proposed parking measures recommended by the Security Department. These proposals are made to resolve the traffic flow problems that occur each semester at the kiosk at the East Campus entrance. Exiting campus and turning left is very dangerous. The bus stop on the west side of Cliff Drive restricts the view of the driver exiting the Main Entrance on East Campus. In addition cars coming down Cliff are moving very fast and the cars turning left into the campus get backed up down Cliff.. This is an extremely hazardous situation that has resulted in numerous accidents over the years. The security staff is put in hazardous situations when attempting to resolve the congestion and is often confronted by angry individuals while performing these duties. Employees and students are sometimes stuck up to an hour attempting to exit the campus during the first few weeks of each semester. Changes need to be made in order to alleviate the confusion and ambiguity that exists on campus regarding parking. These issues were discussed by the task force chaired by John Romo on parking and Transportation which produced many valuable suggestions. The proposal below takes these suggestions and incorporates them into actionable items for the fall of 2006. If the following measures are implemented the parking rules will be easier to understand, and will assist visitors, students and staff with parking on campus. This will reduce the congestion at the kiosk and help to make the East entrance a safer place.

I have asked for a decision by the middle of June in order to implement the changes for fall 2006. I appreciate the efforts of the consultative committees to attempt to meet this goal. There are several reasons for the need to have a decision made within this timeframe:

- First and foremost is the need to do this at the beginning of the fall semester. This is when there is the greatest turnover in new students. It would be very confusing for those continuing students in January if the rules were changed mid-year.
- The parking postcard goes out in the fall. In order to have this completed in time it must be written over the summer. This is our best opportunity to get out to all employees and staff the changes that would occur.
- There is an estimated 60 day lead time on the purchase of the equipment. This lead time and installation would put the timing just prior to the start of the semester.
- It takes time to paint all of the lots and have the signs created. It is extremely important to have the signs up and accurate prior to implementing any changes.

Lot Descriptions/Location

- Lot 1-A is the lot on East Campus next to the Student Services building.
- Lot 1-B is the lot that stretches from the kiosk all the way to the Maxwell Winslow Overlook. The 1-B visitors parking is the area adjacent to the Administration building right outside the Presidents office that has the visitor spaces marked.

- Lot 2-A is the lot closest to Cliff Drive on Loma Alta on the south side of the road.
- Lot 2-B is the middle lot on Loma Alta on the south side, west of Marine Technology and in front of the Sports Pavilion.
- Lot 2-C is the parking lot adjacent to the stadium on the southeast corner of Loma Alta and Shoreline drive.
- Lots 4-A through 4-D are located on the West Campus between Cliff and the Garvin Theatre. Lot 4-A is the lot closest to Cliff Drive, lot 4-B is next to lot 4-A, Lot 4-c is between Lot 4-B and 4-D, Lot is the lot closest to the Garvin Theatre.
- Lots 5-1 through 5-4 are the parking structure located on the West Campus. 5-1 is the lowest and they proceed up in numerical order, (5-1; 5-2; 5-3; 5-4) with 5-4 being the top level of the structure.

East Campus Upper Parking

- To reduce traffic congestion for the first two weeks during the peak evening hours on the upper East Campus, (Lots 1_A and 1-B), a security officer will be present at the exit lane to direct vehicles in making a right turn only. An additional officer will be present at the Bookstore intersection to turn cars around so to prevent a traffic jam by the ECC Blds.
- Current staff parking hours for Lot 1-B is 7:00am-3:00pm. This allows students to park in staff stalls after 3:00pm. Between 4:30 and 5:30pm there is a large number of student vehicles attempting to park as staff are trying to leave creating a traffic jam which prevents staff from being able to exit campus. If staff parking hours are changed to 7:00am-5:30pm then staff would be able to leave without being caught in the traffic congestion. This in return will make more spaces available for students who arrive for evening classes after 5:30pm. In Lot 1-A the parking rule is currently carpool 7:00am-5:00pm, Staff 5:00pm-10:00pm. Because of the proposed change in Lot 1-B for staff 7:00am-5:30pm then Lot 1-A carpool should be extended to 5:30pm.

West Campus Parking

- To keep parking rules consistent throughout campus and to reduce confusion among staff and students the same time change should be done for the West Campus staff lot, 5-1, which is the bottom level of the parking structure. Currently 5-1 is staff parking from 7:00am-3:00pm. Staff parking should be extended to 5:30pm.
- Carpool parking exist in Lot 4-B through 4-D. In Lot 4-D the parking lot is mixed with staff, medical and carpool, (which occupies 25 stalls at the back row of the lot). Allowing carpool to mix with staff in the same parking lot creates a situation where carpool will spill into staff stalls as soon as carpool is full. Though citations are given out to carpoolers that park in staff, having a space available for staff is more important than the citation. It is proposed that the 25 carpool spaces in lot 4-D are changed to staff parking, which will result in an extra 25 staff stalls. To not loose out in the overall number of carpool stalls it is

recommended that Lot 4-A, which is the very first lot from the West entrance, and is student parking, be changed to carpool parking. Lot 4-A holds 54 parking stalls. With the removal of 25 carpool stalls from Lot 4-D and the addition of 54 carpool stalls from Lot 4-A there would be a net gain of 29 carpool stalls. Because of the decrease of activity on the West Campus after 12:00pm it is recommended that the carpool lots change back to regular student parking at 12:00pm.

Posting of new parking signs and upkeep of stenciling

- Security would be responsible for the placement of new parking signs that would show the updated parking information. Included would be the replacement of and adding additional signs that would identify certain parking lots such as Lot 2-C and Lot 3, which are not clearly marked. It is important that students and staff be able to identify the parking lot that they are in from any location of the lot for safety and informational purposes. Security would be responsible for the minor upkeep of the parking lots such as the re-stenciling of worn out strips and lettering. This helps prevent the mistake of parking in the wrong stall.

Additional recommendations

- Installation of parking meters in the East Campus visitor stalls, (Lot 1-A and Lot 1-B), and the installation of parking pass dispensers in the lower student parking lots, (Lot 2-C and Lot 3) and student parking on the West Campus, (Lot 5-2, 5-3, 5-4). Please see Parking Meter and Parking Permit Dispenser proposal.

Parking Permit Dispensers

In order to decrease East Campus traffic congestion and enable students to easily register for classes without the traditional first week confusion around where to park, it is proposed that the College purchase five (5) Day Permit Dispensers to be placed in the entrances to lots 2-C (La Playa Stadium lot), 3 (the Lower West Campus Lot), and 5-2, 3, and 4, (the second, third and fourth levels of the West Campus parking structure). The justification for having parking permit dispensers is that it would first and foremost reduce the traffic congestion at the kiosk from students asking for a free pass. This is greatly increased during the first few weeks but does continue at a high level for the rest of the semester. It would also make it fair for students who bought a parking permit and have to compete with those who try to scam the system to obtain a free pass. It would also take away the difficult decision making that the security officer has to make based on each and every story they hear from everybody who believes that they should get a free pass.

Each of the Day Pass dispensers would be placed at the entrance to the selected lots and sell passes good for parking for the entire day. Students with permits would still be able to park in these lots without the purchase of a day permit. The cost is two dollars for three hours and six dollars for all day. The parking stalls would not be numbered to allow students to come and go with the same permit and because of the problems with dirt and mud in Lot 2-C and Lot 3. Security would also allow a 15 minute grace period

on tickets issued based on the time that a stamped permit was issued. This is so to allow a student to park and walk to the ticket dispenser, obtain a permit and then walk back to their car to place it on their dash. Additionally, as a warning, each machine and ticket would have to visibly state that the individual parking **IS NOT** guaranteed a parking spot if they leave, and then return to, campus.

A recommendation was made that there be no parking permit required after 7:00 PM due to the performance arts and sporting or special events. Security is currently notified when there is a play or a game and do not ticket on those nights. The process is already in place to ensure that the patrons are not ticketed and this could be extended to ensure that there would not be a parking fee charged. Rather than open the campus on every night security has proposed that we put up signs on the night of the events “NO PARKING PERMITS REQUIRED” with security guards present to provide additional support. The dispensers could also be turned off or programmed to provide that message so no one would pay by accident. If the campus is open every night at 7:00 PM for open parking it would disadvantage the students that purchased a permit.

Hourly Parking Meters

In order to deal with the demand for visitor passes, and the traffic congestion this demand creates in the issuance of such passes at the East Campus kiosk, it is proposed that Parking Meters be purchased and installed. In order to ensure that the metered spaces are used as true short-term parking, it is recommended that prices be set at 25¢ for 10 minutes, with a maximum of one hour, (preventing students from attending class while occupying metered spaces). This is to work in conjunction with the proposed purchase of day-pass dispensers allowing one-day visitors to park inexpensively in comparison with continually feeding a meter.

A visitor, student and staff, (the staff who wish to stay longer than 20 minutes) would be required to pay for meter parking. Guests are those who are placed on our guest list such as those meeting with the president, VP's, deans, guest speakers, or those who are providing a service for students. They would be given a visitor pass for meter parking for as much time as they need.

The Lot 1-A location provides immediate access for Student Services, allowing access to textbook orders and purchases, registration and grade drop-offs, and obtaining faculty parking permits. The Lot 1-B (visitors) location provides immediate access for the administration (mailboxes) and the foundation. The revised proposal would be to put 10 meters where the visitor spaces are out in front of Administration. The rest of the spaces would be marked as reserved for the foundation and all staff permits under 50.

Currently the Foundation and Staff with permits of 50 and below take up 10-15 spaces in the Admin parking lot and in lot 1-A, student services. By making the spaces in front of Admin designated reserved it would eliminate medical and handicap from parking there keeping the spaces free. These spaces could also be designated for board members on meeting days. There would be signage on the days of the meetings that required the space to be vacated by 3:00 PM for the board members.

Faculty that were coming over to the East campus to pick up mail or to visit their Dean could stop at the kiosk to pick up a twenty minute parking permit free of charge. If they were staying longer it would be anticipated that they could park in staff parking or pay the meter to stay longer.

Visitors to the District that were registered with Security (e.g. to visit the President or Foundation) would be given visitor passes that would be good in any lot for as much time as needed.

Parking Measures for 2006

Current Procedures:

- First two weeks of the semester temporary workers were stationed at the entrance to staff lots, 2-B, 4-D and 5-1. After the two weeks there is continuous patrol to ticket violators who park in staff parking.
- First three weeks an officer was stationed at the Bookstore intersection turning students around and enforcing drop-offs and pick-ups at the front entrance to protect staff parking and to relieve congestion. After three weeks an officer will make continuous rounds to ticket violators.
- Hours for the carpool table were extended from 7:30am-9:00am to 7:30am-5:00pm so to help take traffic congestion away from the kiosk.
- The West Kiosk hours were extended from 6:50am-12:00pm to 6:50am-3:00pm so to help relieve traffic coming to the East Kiosk for parking passes.
- The introduction of the electronic sign at the bottom of Cliff Dr. demonstrated the ability to alert students of any parking messages, which can be very useful especially if used in conjunction with the plan to install parking permit dispensers so to divert traffic from the East Campus entrance.
- Implementation of the East and West Campus electric shuttle enables students to cross campus faster/easier, to make parking in lower lots more accessible and to provide extra security patrol in the more isolated areas of the parking lots of Lot 2-C, Lot 3 and Pershing Park.

Proposed Procedures:

- To reduce traffic congestion for the first two weeks in the upper East Campus during the evening hours a security officer will be present at the exit lane to direct vehicle in making a right turn only. An additional officer will be present at the Bookstore intersection to turn cars around so to prevent a traffic jam by the ECC Blds.
- Current staff parking hours for lot 1-B is 7:00am-3:00pm. This allows students to compete with staff for parking between 3:00 and 5:00 PM creating a situation where staff is stuck in traffic when trying to leave campus. If staff parking hours are changed to 7:00am-5:00pm then staff would be able to leave without creating the traffic problems. In addition there will be more spaces available for students who arrive for evening classes after 5:00 PM. The same could also be done on the West Campus in the bottom level of the parking structure.
- Installation of parking meters on the East Campus so to allow visitor parking for those who have business or a need for quick access. Instead of stopping at the kiosk visitors can go straight to meter parking.
- Installation of parking pass dispensers will also reduce traffic congestion at the main entrance. Students would go directly to the parking lots instead of entering the main campus, circling the lots and then exiting onto Cliff Dr to find parking.

Hourly Parking Meters

In order to deal with the demand for visitor passes, and the traffic congestion this demand creates in the issuance of such passes at the East Campus kiosk, it is proposed that Parking Meters be purchased and installed in Lot 1A near the Student Services building and Lot 1B near the Book Store. The meters would satisfy the need for true, short-term visitor parking.

The Lot 1-B location provides immediate access for the Campus Bookstore and the Lot 1-A location provides immediate access for Student Services, allowing access to mailboxes, textbook orders and purchases, registration and grade drop-offs, and obtaining faculty parking permits.

The cost, (taxes included) of purchasing twenty-five (25) meters, posts, hoods, and a collection canister is \$11,257.45, (Tri-State Meter Inc.). Each individual meter, (with post and hood), costs \$425.60. A collection canister costs \$591.25.

In order to ensure that the metered spaces are used as true short-term parking, it is recommended that prices be set at 25¢ for 10 minutes, with a maximum of one hour, (preventing students from attending class while occupying metered spaces). This is to work in conjunction with the proposed purchase of day-pass dispensers allowing one-day visitors to park inexpensively in comparison with continually feeding a meter. To recover the cost of purchasing 25 meters from Tri-State Meter Inc., 7,505 hours of parking would need to be purchased, or 301 hours per meter. After the purchasing costs had been recovered the revenue generated by the meters could go into the parking fund to help pay for other traffic control measures.

Lot 1-B visitor parking (immediately west of the Administration Building upon entering the East Campus) would be converted to staff parking, subsequently there would be no loss of spaces for staff.

One-Day Parking Pass Dispensers

In order to decrease East Campus traffic congestion and enable students to easily register for classes without the traditional first week confusion around where to park, it is proposed that the College purchase five (5) Day Pass dispensers to be placed in the entrances to lots 2C (La Playa Stadium lot), 3 (the Lower West Campus Lot), and 5-2, 3, and 4, (the second, third and fourth levels of the West Campus parking structure).

Each of the Day Pass dispensers, (identical to those used at the UCSB parking structure), would be placed at the entrance to the selected lots and sell passes good for parking for the entire day. Students with permits would still be able to park in these lots without the purchase of a day pass.

For five (5) such dispensers the total cost would be \$48,700. Each individual unit would cost \$9,740. The quoted purchasing price for three (3) units, (distributed by Digital Payment Technologies Corporation), was \$27,720.

In order to recover the initial cost of such a traffic measure, it is recommended that a day pass cost \$5 - \$7, (UCSB currently charges \$8 for a day pass). At \$6 per day pass, a parking pass dispenser could be repaid after the purchase of 1,623 day passes, after which point revenue generated by the devices could go into the parking fund to help pay for other traffic control measures. A secondary pass would be available from the dispensers at \$2.00 for 3 hours.

At an estimate of 150 tickets per day, (30 per lot), for the first 6 weeks of each semester, (12 weeks total), the revenue generated would be \$36,000, (150 passes x 4 days per week x \$5 per pass x 12 weeks per year). For the remaining weeks that school is in session, the revenue generated would be \$20,000 (50 passes per lot x 4 days per week x \$5 per pass x 20 weeks per year). The total revenue generated is conservatively estimated at \$56,000 per year.

***Additionally, as a warning, each machine and ticket would have to visibly state that the individual parking IS NOT guaranteed a parking spot if they leave, and then return to, campus.

A recommendation was made that there be no parking permit required after 7:00 PM due to the performance arts and sporting or special events. Security is currently notified when there is a play or a game and do not ticket on those nights. The process is already in place to ensure that the patrons are not ticketed and this could be extended to ensure that there would not be a parking fee charged. Rather than open the campus on every night security has proposed that we put up signs on the night of the events “NO PARKING PERMITS REQUIRED” with security guards present to provide additional support. The dispensers could also be turned off or programmed to provide that message so no one would pay by accident. If the campus is open every night at 7:00 PM for open parking it would disadvantage the students that purchased a permit.