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PREFACE

For the past decade, California Community Colleges have been faced with the challenge of providing quality educational services to all students seeking entry into the system. The 2011-12 proposed State Budget does little to improve the funding challenges that the colleges continue to face. Having said that, we know that the confluence of the current economy, the state’s financial system and the impact of past spending patterns have combined to create huge state budget deficits—the most current one is now estimated at $26.4 billion.

We know that the community colleges will certainly feel the pain as Governor Brown and the Legislature attempt to reach agreement on a balanced state budget. On one hand, we believe strongly that the ability of the state to manage its financial affairs well over the long term is a key to the future; but, on the other, we know that California’s citizens seeking a college education and a record number of unemployed workers in need of retraining require better than the meager amount this Budget will afford them.

The dilemma of how to balance a diminished State Budget in the face of growing needs is at the core of the Legislature and Administration’s willingness to agree to a spending plan. How much to cut? How much to tax? Which sectors of government take the cuts and which should be spared? These questions are central to the discussion—and there are no easy answers any more. Reasonable people can, have, and will disagree on the best way forward, and yet, an answer must be found.

Governor Brown has proposed a balanced approach to close the budget deficit of $26.4 billion by combining spending cuts with extensions of revenues and other solutions to balance the budget this year, and into the future. He also provides for a reserve. The Budget reduces spending by $12.5 billion, and increases revenues $12 billion by maintaining current tax rates for another five years. The Budget also proposes to uniformly apply the single sales factor income allocation rules to certain corporate taxpayers and to eliminate an ineffective tax expenditure programs.

The Governor’s budget plan calls for the Legislature to adopt a budget over the next 60 days that includes the necessary statutory changes needed to implement the budget and place a ballot measure before the voters by June that will extend the current tax rates. The Governor has made it clear that if the voters do not approve the extension of the current tax rates, it will result in deeper cuts to all state funded programs including the suspension of Proposition 98.

We know that the choices to be made are all hard, and the impact of what is ultimately decided will affect millions of Californians for years to come. But, at the same time, we recognize that California’s flawed finance and budgeting system is likely to foster a repeat of this scenario in the future unless the difficult changes are made now.

We think that, at a bare minimum, the Legislature and Administration should be looking at two things: First, the increase in student enrollment fees (from $26 to $36 per unit as proposed by the Governor) should remain with the local districts. The $10 per unit increase should not be an offset to state
revenues but rather, should benefit the colleges as they see fit. Second, at a time when state funding is clearly failing our public education system, at the very least, the Legislature could provide local districts with increased flexibility and the authority to adjust as needed various fees without restriction. These fees would include materials fees, parking fees, technology fees and similar offsets to the expense of operations.

Finally, I would encourage you to remember that when there is rain, there will eventually be sunshine. As we fight to survive in the short term, we shouldn’t forget that there is also a long term, with brighter prospects. I wish you well in all of your endeavors—personal and professional. Remember, I have been honored to serve you.

Arnold Bray
Legislative Advocate (Retired)
Overview of the Community College Budget for 2011-12
OVERVIEW OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE BUDGET FOR 2011-12

For the California Community Colleges, the budget proposes the following:

- **No mid-year cuts.** However, if the Governor’s tax extension proposal is not approved by the voters in June, more cuts will likely occur.

- **$400 million cut for “Apportionment Reductions and Reforms.”** While few details are provided, the budget proposal states an intent to enact “reforms to census accounting practices to provide better incentives for maximizing academic course sections available for student seeking vocational certificates and transfer to four-year colleges within the diminished level of funding.”

The budget proposal goes on to state that the Administration intends to work with the Board of Governors, Chancellor’s Office and other stakeholders to “develop specific census date reforms and other changes to apportionment funding that result in equitably spreading reductions while rewarding colleges for ensuring necessary prerequisites to enrollment are met, assisting students in completing courses they enroll in, and prioritizing course offerings needed for transfer and vocational skills. This can be accomplished in a variety of ways, including adjusting funding rates for priority courses, developing base apportionment adjustment factors related to course completion rates and other strategies. Under this policy, colleges will have a greater incentive to offer the courses necessary for transfer, vocational certificates, and other priority academic programs necessary for students to acquire the skills needed for the 21st century economy.” While it is unclear exactly what the Administration has in mind, a $400 million cut would represent a funding reduction of approximately 7 percent.

- **Student enrollment fee increase from $26 to $36 per credit unit.** This increase is expected to generate $110 million in new revenue that would be used to support additional enrollments.

- **Enrollment growth of 1.9 percent.** Funded by the $110 million in revenues generated by the increase in student enrollment fees, this translates to 22,700 full-time equivalent students or approximately 50,000 headcount students.

- **Additional $129 million inter-year funding deferral.** This change would bring community college inter-year funding deferrals to a total of $961 million. The deferral would be taken from payments in January through May and paid to districts in October of the following year. If adopted, this additional deferral would likely be a permanent addition to community college deferrals.
• No further cuts to student support categorical programs.

• **Categorical flexibility provisions.** Adopted as part of the 2009-10 State Budget these provisions would be extended for two additional years, through 2014-15.

• **Modest downward adjustments in estimated local property taxes ($33.4 million) and student fee revenues ($18.7 million) for 2011-12.** Proposed State General Fund allocations are adjusted upward to offset these revised estimates. According to the Governor’s proposed budget, revised estimates of property taxes in 2010-11 are estimated to decline by $14.7 million. There is no requirement to backfill shortfalls in law. Because of the state’s large budget shortfall no backfill is proposed.

• **Cal Grant Funding.** The Budget appears to maintain full funding for the Cal Grant program.

• **Financial Aid Administration Adjustment.** An increase of $1.7 million in 2011-12 is proposed as a result of a higher estimate for few waivers.

• **Lease Revenue Debt Service.** A decrease of $5.1 million is being proposed for 2011-12 to reflect revised costs of required rental payments used to pay lease-revenue bonds issued for capital outlay projects.

• **Oil and Mineral Revenue Adjustment.** A decrease of $1.1 million is being proposed for 2011-12 as a result of a higher estimate of revenue from this source which offsets the General Fund for apportionments similar to property taxes.

• **Lottery Revenue.** An increase of $12.4 million is being proposed for 2010-11 and 2011-12 as a result of revised estimates of this source for local assistance.

• **COLA.** The budget does not include a cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) for any K-14 programs in 2011-12.

**NOTE:** The Governor’s budget proposal is built on the assumption that the voters will approve approximately $12 billion in additional revenues on the June ballot. Keep in mind that the Democrats have the ability to pass a state budget with a simple majority as a result of the passage of Proposition 25. In spite of this, the Governor has indicated that his plan is to seek and work for the support of at least two-thirds of the State Legislature. No specifics were provided about how the proposal would be modified in the event that the additional revenues do not materialize.
The Prop 98 Guarantee
Proposition 98 Guarantee

A voter-approved constitutional amendment, Proposition 98 guarantees minimum funding levels for K-12 schools and community colleges. The guarantee, which went into effect in the 1988-89 fiscal year, determines funding levels according to multiple factors including the level of funding in 1986-87, General Fund revenues, per capita personal income and school attendance growth or decline.

Proposition 98 originally mandated funding at the greater of two calculations or Tests (Test 1 or Test 2). In 1990, Proposition 111 (SCA 1) was adopted to allow for a third funding test in low revenue years. As a result, three calculations or tests determine funding for school districts and community colleges (K-14). The calculation or test that is used depends on how the economy and General Fund revenues grow from year to year.

In fiscal year 2011-12, it is estimated that the state will be in a Test 1 year. For fiscal year 2010-11, Proposition 98 funding is suspended to a level of $49.7 billion, of which the General Fund share is $36.2 billion, with local property taxes covering the balance. Proposition 98 funding in 2011-12 is proposed to be $49.3 billion. The General Fund share in 2011-12 is $36.0 billion, slightly lower than the $36.2 billion in Proposition 98 General Fund appropriations included in the Budget Act of 2010.

The totals above include funding for K-12, community colleges and other state agencies that serve students.

Proposition 98 Test Calculation

Test 1—Percent of General Fund Revenues: Test 1 is based on a percentage or share of General Fund tax revenues. Historically, school districts and community colleges (K-14) received approximately 40 percent in the 1986-87 fiscal year. As a result of the recent shifts in property taxes from K-14 schools to cities, counties, and special districts, the current rate is approximately 41.22 percent.

Test 2—Adjustment Based on Statewide Income: Test 2 is operative in years with normal to strong General Fund revenue growth. This calculation requires that school districts and community colleges receive at least the same amount of combined state aid and local tax dollars as they received in the prior year, adjusted for enrollment growth and growth in per capita personal income.

Test 3—Adjustment Based on Available Revenues: Test 3 is used in low revenue years when General Fund revenues decline or grow slowly. During such years, the funding guarantee is adjusted according to available resources. A “low revenue year” is defined as one in which General Fund revenue growth per capita lags behind per capita personal income growth more than one-half percentage point. Test 3 was designed so that education is treated no worse in low revenue years than other segments of the state budget.

In years following a Test 3 funding level, the state is required to provide funding to restore what was not allocated the previous year. This is often referred to as a maintenance factor.
Governor's Budget Proposal Summary:

* Defining the Budget Gap
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Introduction

The Governor's Budget proposes to close California's structural budget deficit and provide a strong and stable foundation to meet future needs. This year's spending plan relies on real solutions, most of them ongoing, and proposes a vast and historic realignment of government services.

The state is slowly emerging from the Great Recession, the longest and deepest recession since World War II. More than 1 million jobs were lost in California and the unemployment rate rose to 12.8 percent—the third highest in the nation. Personal income dropped by 2.4 percent, the first decline since 1938. General Fund revenues fell much more, dropping 24 percent from the height of revenues in 2007-08 to the bottom in 2009-10.

Although California has begun to recover, the Budget projects that it will be years before the more than 1 million lost jobs will be recovered. See Figure INT-01. Baseline revenues will not return to the 2007-08 level until 2013-14 and, even then, projected revenues will be insufficient to pay for program services that the state has committed to provide.

In recent years, California has made some difficult choices to close the budget gaps. Taxes were raised temporarily, the Proposition 98 Guarantee was reduced from a high of $56.6 billion to $49.1 billion, resulting in a $7.5 billion decline, programs were eliminated, and spending cuts were adopted. In total, $103.8 billion in budgetary actions were adopted between 2008 and 2010. But most budgetary actions, about 85 percent of them in 2010-11, were temporary or failed because of court challenges or faulty assumptions.
Although the economic downturn has been the chief contributor to today’s budget gap, California entered the recession with an existing structural budget deficit, meaning that revenues did not cover costs. This structural deficit continued, in part, because of an overreliance on temporary remedies and savings proposals that did not materialize. Some actions adopted over the last decade, such as the Economic Recovery Bonds, have made the problem worse, adding $2.9 billion to the projected budget gap in 2011-12.

Without corrective action, as illustrated in Figure INT-03, the structural deficit will persist and grow to between $17.2 billion and $21.5 billion per year through 2014-15. The Governor’s Budget proposes to close this structural gap in a manner that is both balanced and sustainable. Specifically, it proposes significant reforms to state and local programs, substantial reductions to state operations, and spending cuts across
all service areas. The Budget also maintains existing tax rates in effect for another five years, subject to voter approval.

The Governor’s proposal reflects the difficult choices that will be necessary to balance California’s budget this year and into the future. Without decisive action, the state’s severe budget problems will persist, threatening economic recovery, job growth, public education and the quality of life in California. But the adoption of this budget will position the state to lead the country as it slowly recovers from the Great Recession.
**DEFINING THE BUDGET GAP**

California is projected to face a budget gap of $25.4 billion in 2011-12. This gap is made up of a current-year shortfall of $8.2 billion and a budget-year shortfall of $17.2 billion. With a reasonable reserve of $1 billion, $26.4 billion in cuts, taxes and other budget solutions are needed to close the budget gap.

As Figure INT-04 illustrates, various factors contribute to the projected deficit in 2011-12. First, the budget plan adopted in 2010-11 relied in part on unrealistic assumptions, including the receipt of billions of dollars in federal funds, and on spending cuts that were not achieved. These factors contributed $5.3 billion to the budget problem ($3.6 billion federal funds and $1.7 billion reductions).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>June 30, 2011, Reserve Projected as of 2010 Budget Act</th>
<th>$1.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workload Adjustments:</td>
<td>-26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Federal Funds Assumed in 2010-11 Did Not Materialize</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosions of Other Enacted Solutions in 2010-11</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Decline in 2010-11</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 22 Impact in 2010-11 and 2011-12</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Workload Adjustments</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset of Temporary Increases in Tax Rates and Other Revenue Changes in 2011-12</td>
<td>-7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Stimulus Funds Previously Approved by the Federal Government are Expiring</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other One-Time Value of Enacted Solutions in 2010-11</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebuild Reserve</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Solutions Proposed</td>
<td>-$26.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This year's revenues are $3.1 billion lower than were projected at the time of the 2010 Budget Act, in part due to the recently enacted federal Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010. The passage in November of Proposition 22, which prohibits the use of certain transportation funds to pay for debt service or to be loaned to the General Fund, created an additional budget shortfall of $1.6 billion. All other workload adjustments including population and caseload changes added $2.1 billion.
The sunset of temporary increases in tax rates amounts to a projected drop in revenues of over $7 billion from 2010-11 to 2011-12. Federal stimulus funds that temporarily reduced state spending will end in 2010-11, increasing General Fund costs by $4.0 billion. Finally, another $3.4 billion of solutions adopted in 2010-11 will expire at the end of the fiscal year.

**CLOSING THE BUDGET GAP**

To restore local-government authority to make decisions that are best made closer to the people, make government more efficient, and protect core services, the Governor proposes a balanced approach to close the budget gap. As illustrated in Figure INT-05, the Budget includes $26.4 billion in spending cuts, revenues and other solutions to balance the budget this year and into the future, and to provide for a reserve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure INT-05</th>
<th>Proposed Budget Solutions (Dollars in Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2010-11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Reductions</td>
<td>$422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>3,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Budget reduces spending by $12.5 billion. It includes substantial cuts to most major programs, such as $1.7 billion to Medi-Cal, $1.5 billion to California’s welfare-to-work program, $1 billion to the University of California and California State University, $750 million to the Department of Developmental Services, and $580 million to state operations and employee compensation.

Recognizing that school funding has been disproportionately reduced since 2007-08, the Budget maintains Proposition 98 funding (state General Fund and local property tax) for K-12 programs at the same level in 2011-12 as is in effect in 2010-11. To maintain funding for schools, fund public safety services at the local level, and to balance the budget, this proposal maintains current tax rates for another five years. The Budget also proposes to uniformly apply the single sales factor income allocation rules to certain corporate taxpayers and to eliminate an ineffective tax expenditure program. These proposals will generate $12 billion.
Introduction

While most of the budget solutions are ongoing, the Budget includes some one-time savings and borrowing. These include $1.8 billion in borrowing from special funds, $1.7 billion in property tax shifts, $1.0 billion from Proposition 10 reserve to fund children’s programs, and $0.9 billion from Proposition 63 moneys to fund community mental health services. $8.2 billion of the budget gap is one-time in nature. Closing a portion of the gap with some one-time solutions is appropriate because a portion of the budget gap is one-time in nature.

Adopting the Budget’s long-term solutions is critical to eliminating the structural imbalance in the future. Based on the proposed budget, current law, and the latest forecast of the economy, revenue, and program costs, the operating surplus over the forecast period ranges from a low of $7 million to a high of $2.4 billion—a structurally balanced budget each year.

Recognizing the urgency of the state’s fiscal problems, the Budget calls for an accelerated timeline to restore balance to the state’s finances. It assumes that all necessary statutory changes to implement budget solutions will be adopted by the Legislature and signed by the Governor by March. This will allow the necessary ballot measures to be placed before the voters at a statewide special election to be called for June 2011. In addition, early enactment of budget proposals will lead to implementation sooner allowing greater savings to be achieved by the end of 2011-12. Likewise, the Administration expects that the legislative process will be inclusive and that a two-thirds vote will be obtained to quickly implement the statutory changes.

Transforming the State and Local Relationship

The budget proposes a major shift in the state-local relationship by reversing the trend of consolidating control and budget authority in Sacramento. When fully implemented, this proposal will restructure how and where more than $10 billion in a wide range of services are delivered.

This realignment will allow government at all levels to focus on their core functions and become more efficient, more effective and less expensive, by clarifying lines of program responsibility and reducing the duplication of services and administrative costs.

The first phase of this proposal will be a $6.9 billion transfer of programs from the state to the counties funded by maintaining the 1-percent sales tax and the 0.50-percent Vehicle License Fee that are currently set to expire in 2011.
MAJOR REVENUE PROPOSALS

To develop a budget plan that eliminates the current budget gap in a way that is both real and permanent, the Governor’s Budget proposes a balanced approach: one that makes significant cuts in spending programs, and one that maintains critical revenue.

The plan to maintain revenue consists of two parts. The first part would extend the current tax rates for five years. Tax revenue fell significantly further in the recession than did personal income. Although the economy is beginning to recover, baseline revenues are not expected to return to the 2007-08 level until 2013-14; whereas baseline expenditures have grown steadily over this time.

The second part is to eliminate two tax expenditures that are either inefficient or outside the scope of the central mission of state government, and provide the Franchise Tax Board (FTB) with two additional tools to collect taxes owed.

EXTENSION OF CURRENT TAX RATES

There are a variety of ways in which revenue could be raised. The Governor’s Budget proposes to maintain the level of current tax rates and the dependent exemption credit for five years, subject to voter approval.

- The Personal Income Tax (PIT) rate quarter-percent surcharge.
- The PIT dependent exemption credit at the same level as the personal exemption credit.
The Vehicle License Fee (VLF) rate at 1.15 percent.

The Sales and Use Tax (SUT) rate at 6 percent.

This package of tax extensions has several advantages.

First, because these tax rates are already in place, they are less likely to unduly interfere with the economic recovery. These policies have been in place since the spring of 2009, when the nation was still in recession. Since then, the national economy has begun a tepid recovery. Because of the relative severity of its housing crisis, California fell further than most other states during this recession. Nonetheless, California’s growth out of the recession has largely mirrored that of the country. It is uncertain how other tax changes of similar magnitude would affect the economy. The prudent approach is to continue on the current path as opposed to adopting a different set of tax policies that could work their way through the economy in different—and potentially more disruptive—ways.

Second, because these tax rates are already in place, the compliance cost of the policies should be relatively low. The state agencies that administer the taxes, the employers and retailers that collect that taxes, and the households and businesses that ultimately pay the taxes have already absorbed most of these compliance costs.

The four following tax rates are proposed to be maintained for five years:

- **PIT Rate Surcharge:** Effective for tax years beginning on or after January 1, 2011 but before January 1, 2016, maintain the 0.25-percentage point surcharge for each PIT tax rate and the Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT) rate. This proposal is expected to generate revenues of $1,187 million in 2010-11 and $2,077 million in 2011-12.

- **PIT Dependent Exemption Credit:** Maintain the dependent exemption credit in effect in 2009 until 2015 while allowing for annual indexing. This aligns the dependent exemption credit to the amount of the personal exemption credit. Chapter 612, Statutes of 1997, and Chapter 322, Statutes of 1998, increased the dependent exemption credit to $253 for the 1998 tax year and $227 for the 1999 tax year, and indexed for inflation each year thereafter. For the 2010 tax year, the personal exemption credit is $99, as was the dependent exemption credit. This proposal is expected to generate revenues of $725 million in 2010-11 and $1,248 million in 2011-12.
• **SUT**: Effective July 1, 2011, the 6-percent State SUT rate would continue for five years. As revenues generated by 1 percent of the 6-percent tax rate are local purpose revenues (see Realignment Chapter), they are not reflected in the General Fund revenues as shown in Figure REV-01. This proposal is expected to generate revenues of $4,549 million in 2011-12.

• **VLF**: Effective July 1, 2011, the 1.15-percent VLF rate would continue for five years. Of the 1.15-percent rate, 0.5 percent would be used to fund local programs, including public safety. As these revenues are local purpose revenues (see Realignment Chapter), they are not reflected in the General Fund revenues in Figure REV-01. This proposal is expected to generate additional revenues of $1,382 million in 2011-12.

**Other Revenue Proposals**

**Mandatory Single Sales Factor Apportionment (Corporate Income Tax — CIT):**

Corporations with income derived from sources both within and outside California must use a formula that attempts to measure the amount of income that is attributable to California. In the past, for most taxpayers, California has used a four-factor apportionment formula consisting of a payroll factor, a property factor, and a sales factor that is counted twice (double-weighted). As part of the 2009 Budget Act, the Legislature adopted a single sales factor apportionment (SSF) method. The legislation provided for an election, effectively allowing corporations to choose the lower of two tax rates. This proposal would require that all corporations (except those corporations engaged in qualified agricultural, extractive, or banking activities) use SSF. This proposal is expected to generate additional revenues of $468 million in 2010-11 and $942 million in 2011-12, as well as providing several improvements to the way California taxes multi-state corporations.

The goal of moving to single sale factor was to eliminate any tax disincentives that can arise due to investment in new plant (property) and payroll in the state. There is a good argument to be made that in order for California to be competitive with other states, it should allow taxpayers to apportion income using SSF.

However, there is no reason – from an economic development perspective – to allow businesses to choose how their income will be apportioned. Requiring mostly “in-state” firms to use SSF removes a disincentive that they face, under double-weighted
apportionment, from moving economic activity into California. Requiring “out-of-state” firms to use SSF accomplishes the exact same thing. It removes a disincentive that they face, under double-weighted sales apportionment, from moving economic activity into California.

Elective SSF allows the taxpayer to choose what its income is going to be and creates an inequity allowing taxpayers who operate in more then one state two different ways to calculate their income, one of which is likely to produce a much smaller tax than the other, while businesses that operate wholly inside California have no such option. This different treatment puts the wholly in-state businesses (which tend to be smaller businesses) at a competitive disadvantage to multi-state businesses (which tend to be larger businesses).

Changing to a mandatory SSF method will bring California in line with other states. Of the 23 states that have adopted SSF, only three, Missouri, Florida and Kentucky, allow an election. Of those three, only Missouri allows elective SSF for all industries.

This proposal is consistent with the Legislative Analyst’s Office conclusion in their report on Single Sales Factor Apportionment which was published in May of 2010.

Along with adopting elective SSF in 2009, the state also modified some other provisions of the apportionment law. It clarified the definitions of nexus and gross receipts, broadened the definition of sales attributable to “unitary” groups of affiliated businesses, and changed the way sales of services and intangibles are assigned (cost-of-performance rule vs. market rule). These changes both protect against abuses under SSF and reduce the revenue loss from SSF.

In the 2010 Budget Act, the Legislature modified the market assignment rule for sales of services and intangibles to allow taxpayers who do not elect SSF to continue to use a cost-of-performance assignment rule. The Governor’s Budget would require all taxpayers to source the sale of services and intangibles using a market approach, as opposed to a cost-of-performance approach.

Besides allowing for a consistent treatment of sales of tangibles versus intangibles and services, this provision will help to reduce the possibilities for taxpayers arranging their business transactions so as to minimize their tax. Of the three apportionment factors, taxpayers tend to have the greatest ability to manipulate their sales factor. Adopting a market approach to assigning the sales of intangibles and services will help to limit this manipulation.
The FTB estimates that adopting both of these proposals (mandatory SSF and market rule for everyone) would raise over $1 billion on an ongoing basis, relative to elective single sales factor apportionment. This increased tax liability will, generally, come from out-of-state taxpayers who will have higher tax liabilities under a mandatory single sales factor apportionment method due to their exploitation of the California market for their goods and services.

Repeal Enterprise Zone Tax Benefits (CIT and PIT):

Consistent with the new model for funding economic development (See Tax Relief and Local Government Chapter), the Budget proposes to eliminate all enterprise zone (EZ) tax incentives and similar tax incentives for specific areas for tax years beginning on or after January 1, 2011. These areas include EZs, Targeted Tax Areas, Manufacturing Enhancement Areas, and Local Agency Military Base Recovery Areas. The tax benefits provided for most of these areas include; a hiring credit, a credit for sales tax paid, a credit for employees who earn wages within the area, and a deduction for interest received from businesses in an area. This proposal would eliminate these tax benefits, both for newly earned credits and deductions and for credits that had been earned in prior years, but had not yet been used. Local agencies that want to keep any local incentives could continue to do so.

This proposal is expected to generate additional revenues of $343 million in 2010-11 and $581 million in 2011-12.

Within the context of a budget that proposes deep spending reductions across state government, all spending must be scrutinized. The EZ program is a tax expenditure—an expenditure program for local economic development run through the tax system. The Budget proposes to make significant changes in the way funding of local development efforts is handled. These changes are intended to move the responsibility and the authority for local development efforts to the local jurisdictions and their voters. Eliminating state tax benefits for EZs is a fundamental part of this change. Because the primary benefit of these zones is to shift economic activity from one geographic region within California to another geographic region within California, they are not of statewide interest.

The Legislative Analyst's Office "California's Enterprise Zone Programs"—2005 found that EZs have little if any impact on the creation of new economic activity or employment. They also found that EZs appear to be somewhat effective in increasing economic activity within smaller geographic areas—such as within metropolitan regions. However, these
increases are not generally a result of new activity, but, instead, from the shift of activity into a zone that otherwise would have occurred elsewhere.

According to a report by the W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research (State Enterprise Zones: Have they Worked – 2002), “most enterprise zone incentives are too small to materially affect the investment and location behavior of most firms.” The jobs created in many zones are filled by people who are not economically disadvantaged or do not live in the targeted area. They also conclude that since many of the benefits will be jobs that would have been created anyway, state and local government will see a net loss of $60,000 for every job created in a zone.

The Public Policy Institute of California found “Do California Enterprise Zones Create Jobs?” – 2009 that there was “no statistically significant effect on either employment levels or employment growth rates” within enterprise zones as compared to neighboring areas.

There is some evidence that benefits from the EZ programs go to taxpayers whose behavior has not been affected at all by the EZ program. There are firms that specialize in finding businesses that could benefit from an EZ program and offering to prepare the taxpayer’s return on a percent of benefit basis. This is done for both current year and back-year tax returns. Clearly taxpayer’s behavior to relocate or expand is not being driven by the existence of the EZ program if they have to be told that the program exists after they have already relocated or expanded.

**Tax Shelter Amnesty (CIT and PIT):**

The Budget proposes to allow the FTB to provide an amnesty for taxpayers who utilized an abusive tax-avoidance transaction. Abusive Tax Avoidance Transactions (ATATs) serve no purpose other than reducing tax. The IRS, the FTB, and the courts generally deny claimed tax benefits of an ATAT if the transaction that gives rise to those benefits lacks economic substance independent of income tax considerations. This proposal would authorize the FTB to provide a narrow tax amnesty for taxpayers that utilized an ATAT. This proposal would also provide an amnesty for the underreporting of California income resulting from offshore financial arrangements. This proposal would improve FTB enforcement tools and deter taxpayers from engaging in these activities that have no economic substance other than tax avoidance. Additionally, this proposal would reduce case backlogs at FTB. This proposal is expected to generate additional revenues of $270 million in 2010-11 and to decrease revenues by $50 million in 2011-12.
FINANCIAL INSTITUTION RECORD MATCH (FIRM) (CIT AND PIT):

The Budget proposes to require financial institutions to participate in a record match process between financial institution customer records and FTB debtor records. FTB would use the match information to collect delinquent state income tax debts using existing laws and collection methods. Currently, FTB receives Form 1099 data on interest income earned by taxpayers. This information can be used by FTB to find bank accounts owned by delinquent taxpayers. However, this information is deficient in two ways. First, FTB only has access to information on interest-bearing accounts. Second, the information FTB receives is for interest that was earned in the prior year. By the time FTB issues an order-to-withhold on the account, the taxpayer may have closed or moved the account.

FIRM would provide FTB with current information on all bank accounts - interest-bearing and otherwise - that delinquent taxpayers may have. This approach has been used successfully by the Department of Child Support Services to collect money from delinquent child support payers. This proposal would help close the tax gap and collect additional revenue from taxpayers who have not paid their legally required share of taxes. Additionally, the use of timely financial data will reduce current collection process inefficiencies due to levies being issued based on outdated account information. This proposal is expected to generate additional revenues of $10 million in 2010-11 and $30 million in 2011-12.

Figure REV-02 shows the total impact of the tax solutions and associated spending on the Governor’s Budget.
Figure REV-11

Tobacco Tax Revenue
(Dollars in Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>2009-10 Preliminary</th>
<th>2010-11 Forecast</th>
<th>2011-12 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$96.2</td>
<td>$93.0</td>
<td>$90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigarette and Tobacco Products Surtax Fund</td>
<td>293.7</td>
<td>285.0</td>
<td>277.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breast Cancer Fund</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Children and Families First Trust Fund</td>
<td>512.1</td>
<td>497.0</td>
<td>482.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigarette and Tobacco Products Compliance Fund</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$923.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$895.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>$888.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may not add due to rounding.

### Property Taxes

Article XIII-A of the State Constitution (Proposition 13) provides that property is assessed at its 1975 fair market value until it changes ownership. When ownership changes, the assessed value is redetermined based on the property’s current market value. New construction is assessed at fair market value when construction is completed. A property’s base year value may be increased by an inflation factor, not to exceed 2 percent annually.

Although the property tax is a local revenue source, the amount of property tax generated each year has a substantial impact on the state budget because local property tax revenues allocated to K-14 schools offset General Fund expenditures. Assessed value growth is estimated based on twice-yearly surveys of county assessors and evaluation of real estate trends. Continued declines in sales volumes and prices, coupled with declines in property values and failures to remit property tax payments as a result of mortgage defaults and foreclosures, continue to negatively impact assessed values and property tax levies. Property tax collections are estimated to decrease 5 percent from 2009-10 to 2010-11. As the process of foreclosing on properties with delinquent mortgages accelerates in 2011-12, and those properties are resold, the decline in property tax revenues is expected to end. However, no positive growth in revenues is anticipated, leading to a forecast of zero percent growth for 2011-12.

Property taxes received by school districts and reflected in the Department of Education and Community Colleges budgets are significantly below projections used for the 2010-11 Governor’s Budget.
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INTRODUCTION

The Community Colleges System Budget Proposal for fiscal year 2011-12 was prepared in the context of California’s worst fiscal crisis since the Great Depression. The state has experienced an unprecedented decline in revenues, which is impacting all sectors of state government, including the community colleges, and will likely continue to present a major threat for the next several years.

This proposal is built upon the premise that the California Community Colleges are poised to play a critical role in the state’s economic recovery. The community college system’s size and geographic distribution make it the only segment of higher education capable of delivering education and workforce training on the large scale needed to assist in the state’s economic turnaround. Evidence of the community colleges’ ability to directly impact the workforce and the economy abounds: for example, community colleges train 70% of the state’s nurses, and 80% of the state’s firefighters, law enforcement officers and emergency medical technicians. In 2007-08, the colleges awarded 1,600 certificates in nursing and allied health fields, and 700 certificates in construction and building trades, to name just two industry areas vital to the state’s economy. In 2009-10, the community colleges provided education and training to nearly 2.8 million students at 112 colleges, making it the largest higher education system in the world. Only the community colleges have the educational infrastructure required to serve millions of Californians, at all stages of their educational and professional careers, in the timeframe necessary to address the state’s current economic challenges.

Unfortunately, as a result of California’s economic crisis, the community colleges suffered significant cuts of almost 8 percent in the 2009-10 state budget, including a $313 million reduction in student support programs and a $190 million reduction in general apportionment. These cuts came at the worst possible time, as community colleges faced unprecedented demand due to persistent statewide unemployment over 12 percent, the largest high school graduating class in state history, students being displaced from UC and CSU due to budget cuts, and veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan.

The substantial budget cuts had a severe impact on the colleges, resulting in over six percent of course sections being cancelled. As a result of high demand and cuts in course sections, students attempting to enroll in a community college in 2009-10 found either overcrowded classrooms or no classes available at all. Due to the mismatch between enrollment demand and available funding, the colleges served more than 200,000 students for which they received no state funding in 2009-10. Further, we estimate that as many as 138,000 additional students who wanted to attend college were turned away due to lack of available course sections. In short, the situation on community college campuses today is dire. Colleges cannot continue to accept students for whom they receive no state funding – although they temporarily accommodated last year’s students by increasing class sizes and spending their reserves, these practices are not sustainable. Absent additional funding, colleges will be forced to restrict their class offerings even more, at a time when demand for a community college education is growing at unprecedented levels.

In light of these circumstances, the California Community College budget proposal focuses on restoring the core capacity of the colleges to meet California’s education and training needs. The proposal is built around the following three elements: Student Success, Educational Quality, and Access.
Student Success

Research and experience demonstrate that student success is enhanced by the provision of quality student support services at the colleges, including such activities as orientation, counseling, and tutoring. Other student support services—including grants to cover costs of textbooks, subsidized childcare, and financial aid counseling—are especially important to promote the success of economically disadvantaged students. All of these student support services were cut substantially in the 2009-10 fiscal year, resulting in significant reductions averaging 41 percent. As a result, at the campus level, direct services to students, including disabled and economically disadvantaged students, were cut substantially. To address these critical needs, this budget proposal requests a restoration of the $313 million in cuts to student support programs that directly impact student success rates.

Educational Quality

In recent years, community college budgets have not kept pace with inflation. In 2008-09 and 2009-10, the colleges were denied the cost of living adjustments (COLAs) prescribed in statute, resulting in a loss of purchasing power of 9.4 percent over those two years. This is a true loss in the colleges’ spending power. As costs rise for non-discretionary items such as utilities, insurance premiums, and health care costs, college budgets are spread thin. Fewer resources are available for key investments such as recruiting faculty, offering course sections, and providing student services. The estimated COLA for 2011-12 is 1.35 percent. When combined with the 9.4 percent lost over the two prior years, this totals a cumulative COLA of 10.88 percent, or $661 million. This budget proposal requests half that amount, $330 million, in 2011-12 with the remainder provided in the following year.

Access

Enrollment demand at the community colleges has reached unprecedented levels. Persistent unemployment over 12 percent, the largest high school graduating class in state history, students being displaced from UC and CSU due to budget cuts, and veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan are straining the capacity of the community colleges to provide access. While the demand for a community college education is up, the funding provided by the state was inadequate to fund all students in 2007-08 and 2008-09, and overall funding actually declined in 2009-10. Colleges responded by reducing their course offerings by as much as 20%, yet still served an increasing number of students, which is unsustainable without additional funding. This budget proposal requests funding for 4.7 percent enrollment growth, or $273 million, to provide access to 57,000 more full-time equivalent students (FTES).
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
2011-12 Budget Overview

The California Community Colleges System Budget Proposal was developed in accordance with the Consultation process established under state law. A budget workgroup comprised of members and designees of the Consultation Council, other college representatives, and Chancellor's Office staff met to discuss funding priorities and work on details of the budget request. The workgroup's budget proposal was then discussed at the August meeting of the Consultation Council where it received the general support of that body.

The System Budget Proposal is based on the following assumptions:

- In recognition of the state’s current budget crisis, it is necessary to prioritize funding to support core programs and services, including restoration of funding cut in the 2009-10 State Budget. Without resources to meet these base needs, the capacity of the colleges to deliver education and workforce training is significantly compromised. No major funding increases for new initiatives or program expansions are being requested in this proposal.

- California’s economy is in crisis and will require large-scale workforce training in order to restore our economic competitiveness. The state’s economic recovery will depend upon workers being trained or retrained in many new fields, such as “green” technologies, advanced manufacturing, and health professions. The community colleges are uniquely positioned to help California prepare workers for jobs in the recovering economy. Our expertise in delivering education and training, combined with our presence in communities across the state, make us an integral part of the solution to this economic crisis.

As the largest workforce training provider in the state, the community colleges contribute significantly to California’s ability to compete in the global economy. New and emerging industries, including solar technologies, need trained technicians who are being prepared for these careers by the state’s community colleges. Any delay in providing adequate funding to the community college system will only elongate the time needed for the state to achieve a substantial economic recovery.

The recommended increase in the system budget for 2011-12 totals $917 million to address three core priorities: restoration of categorical funding reductions; cost of living adjustment (COLA); and enrollment growth, which are directly related to the system’s goals of student success, educational quality, and access. These recommended funding increases are described in further detail in the next section, 2011-12 Budget Narrative.
2011-12 BUDGET NARRATIVE

In recognition of the state’s fiscal crisis, this budget request focuses on the resources necessary for the colleges to maintain core educational services. Deep funding cuts of 8.1 percent in 2009-10 have forced community college districts to grapple with a range of difficult choices including reducing course sections, laying off classified staff, not renewing part-time faculty positions, keeping positions vacant, reducing the availability of student services, and preparing for additional layoffs for the following year. Many districts have elected to use budget reserves to temporarily postpone a portion of the cuts in order to allow more time for planning and implementation of budget reductions. However, this tactic is not sustainable, and districts will be required to make deeper cuts to their budgets and course offerings.

The Community Colleges and California’s Economic Recovery

The California Community Colleges are uniquely positioned to help the state address the current economic crisis. The community colleges have an unparalleled track record of delivering a wide range of education and training programs designed to meet local student and employer needs. Following are some of the many ways the community colleges have met the state’s demand for high quality education and training:

- More than 70 percent of California’s higher education students are enrolled in a CCC.¹
- Approximately 70 percent of all new nurses trained in California are trained at a CCC.²
- On average, students completing a degree or certificate at a CCC increase their earnings by 63 percent, or $18,630, within three years.³
- Almost 60 percent of all graduates of the California State University (CSU) and 30 percent of graduates of the University of California (UC) transferred from a CCC.⁴

Considering the critical role the community colleges play in educating the workforce, the Chancellor’s Office has developed this System Budget Proposal to ensure that colleges can function at maximum effectiveness to assist in the state’s economic recovery. The three areas for which the community college system requests funding are: restoration of categorical funding; COLA; and enrollment growth, and each is linked to one of the core goals of Student Success, Educational Quality, and Access. Details on each of these areas is provided below.

² Data obtained from California Board of Registered Nursing, 2005-2006 Annual School Report.
³ 2007 Focus on Results, Accountability Reporting in the California Community Colleges.
⁴ 2007 Focus on Results, Accountability Reporting in the California Community Colleges.
Success, Quality, and Access

Restoration of Student Support Program Funding ($313,342,000) The revised 2009-10 budget reduced ongoing funding for student support programs by $313 million or an average of 42 percent. Cuts varied by individual program and ranged from no cut to total elimination (see Table 1 for a complete display of 2009-10 categorical program cuts). Many of these programs provide critical support services to students, such as counseling, orientation, and tutoring, which are vital in enhancing student success. Other categorical programs provide funding to support specific instructional programs, including basic skills and career and technical education. In order to preserve core student support services and instructional programs, we therefore request restoration of the $313 million that was cut from student support programs in 2009-10.

As part of this request, we are also seeking $200,000 to fund California Community Colleges Student Senate activities associated with the students' shared governance responsibilities. The Student Senate has never received direct funding to support student participation in the community college governance system. Instead, the Chancellor's Office has historically funded meetings of the Student Senate and student travel to shared governance meetings in order to sustain their involvement. It has been necessary to reduce our annual commitment, however, in line with significant reductions to the Chancellor's Office budget in recent years. The Student Senate has also solicited donations from campus student organizations to supplement their operating funds, but critically strained budgets at the colleges and at the Chancellor's Office have made these funding sources inadequate and unreliable. Therefore, in conjunction with the restoration of the 2009-10 student support program cuts, we are asking for funding for the Student Senate.

COLA ($330,621,000) Historically, the community colleges have received annual COLA increases. However, due to the deteriorating economic situation, the state did not provide a COLA to colleges for fiscal years 2008-09 and 2009-10. The price index specified by law for the community college COLA calculation is identical to that specified for K-12 education, the state and local government price deflator published by the federal government. For 2008-09, the statutory COLA was 4.94 percent, and for 2009-10 the statutory COLA was 4.25 percent. For 2011-12, the statutory COLA is estimated to be 1.35 percent. (No COLA was forecast for 2010-11.) Cumulatively, the colleges are owed a total of 10.88 percent to make up for the lost purchasing power they experienced over the past few years due to the lack of COLAs. We request that this be made up over a two-year period, and thus are requesting half of this COLA in 2011-12, approximately 5.5 percent.

As the purchasing power of the colleges erodes, so too does their capacity to serve students. When not addressed through a COLA, nondiscretionary cost increases in areas such as staffing, employee health benefits, and utilities diminish colleges' spending power and force budget cuts in other areas. The resulting budget cuts have negative impacts on students, including decreases in the number and variety of courses offered, reduced ability to develop new curriculum in response to changing workforce needs, and fewer counselors being available to assist students. The quality of the education that students receive is negatively impacted when COLAs are not provided. We request that the remainder of the unfunded COLAs be restored in future years as the state's fiscal condition improves, as is the practice with K-12 schools.
Enrollment Growth ($272,824,000) Education Code section 84750.5 states that the annual statewide enrollment growth request shall be based on, at a minimum, the sum of:

1) The annual statewide percentage change in the adult population; and
2) The statewide unemployment rate in excess of five percent. This factor is capped at two percent.

Based on the most recent data, the annual increase in the adult population is 1.36 percent and the unemployment rate is 12.3 percent. Using these two factors, the statutory minimum enrollment growth rate would provide the colleges with 3.36 percent enrollment growth funding in 2010-11, allowing an additional 41,000 full-time equivalent students (FTES) to be served throughout the state. It should be noted in this period of high unemployment that, absent the two percent cap, this formula would result in a growth rate of 8.66 percent.

Recent experience corroborates the need for enrollment growth funding above the minimum level, as college campuses have seen a trend of strong growth in student demand for additional courses. The system has seen an average of 4.1 percent enrollment growth over the past several years. Unfortunately, due to a shortage of enrollment growth funding in the state budget, not all eligible growth was funded in 2007-08. This was the first time since 2003-04 that the state was not able to fully fund enrollment demand. Then again in 2008-09, the system experienced unfunded growth, totaling more than 52,000 FTES. This trend continued in the recently completed 2009-10 fiscal year, with the system absorbing the costs of more than 92,000 unfunded FTES. In addition to record numbers of students being accommodated in overcrowded classes, colleges experienced a significant increase in the length of waiting lists of students wanting to get into full classes, in some cases as much as two or three times the number of students in the class.

Our forecast for 2011-12 anticipates a continuation of strong enrollment demand based on the following circumstances:

- A struggling economy will force displaced workers to return to school to acquire additional job skills. High unemployment always leads to higher college enrollments.

- Increasingly, currently employed workers will need to update technical skills in order to remain competitive in the workplace and to meet the economy’s need to compete in new technologies and industries.

- Fee increases and restricted admissions at the University of California and the California State University will lead more students to begin their four-year college education in the community colleges.

Failure to sufficiently fund enrollment growth would impede access to higher education by limiting the ability of the community colleges to meet California’s pressing education and workforce training needs. This is a huge concern, especially during a time of high unemployment throughout the state. California’s most cost-effective strategy for meeting the higher education access needs of its citizens within constrained state resources is to place the maximum possible emphasis on access to the community colleges, given the far lower costs to the state of the community colleges compared to any other education segment.
Based on recent growth trends and the factors noted above, including the large number of students turned away in 2009-10, we propose the state fund enrollment growth of 4.7 percent or $272 million in 2011-12, which would allow an additional 57,000 FTES to be served above the current level of students funded by the state.
BUDGET REQUEST SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restoration of Student Support Program Funding</td>
<td>$313,342,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Living Adjustment: 5.5%</td>
<td>$330,621,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Growth: 4.7%</td>
<td>$272,824,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funding Request</td>
<td>$916,787,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Restoration of Student Support Program Funding Cuts: 2011-12
(dollars in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Support Programs</th>
<th>2009-10 State Allocation</th>
<th>Total 2009-10 Reduction</th>
<th>2011-12 Restoration Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Financial Aid Administration</td>
<td>$52,884</td>
<td>$1,615</td>
<td>$2,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care Education Program</td>
<td>$5,254</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund for Student Success</td>
<td>$3,793</td>
<td>$(2,365)</td>
<td>$2,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalWORKs</td>
<td>$26,695</td>
<td>$(16,885)</td>
<td>$16,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Success Initiative - Basic Skills</td>
<td>$20,037</td>
<td>$(13,063)</td>
<td>$13,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Support</td>
<td>$13,378</td>
<td>$(8,722)</td>
<td>$8,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Students</td>
<td>$69,223</td>
<td>$(45,788)</td>
<td>$45,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Opportunity Programs &amp; Services</td>
<td>$73,604</td>
<td>$(48,687)</td>
<td>$48,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecom &amp; Technology Services</td>
<td>$15,290</td>
<td>$(10,907)</td>
<td>$10,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Senate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>$317</td>
<td>$(150)</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare Tax Bail Out</td>
<td>$3,351</td>
<td>$(3,485)</td>
<td>$3,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Employment Opportunity</td>
<td>$767</td>
<td>$(980)</td>
<td>$980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>$22,930</td>
<td>$(23,860)</td>
<td>$23,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeship</td>
<td>$7,175</td>
<td>$(7,466)</td>
<td>$7,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Faculty Office Hours</td>
<td>$3,515</td>
<td>$(3,657)</td>
<td>$3,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Faculty Health Insurance</td>
<td>$491</td>
<td>$(509)</td>
<td>$509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Faculty Compensation</td>
<td>$24,908</td>
<td>$(25,920)</td>
<td>$25,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Education and Articulation</td>
<td>$698</td>
<td>$(726)</td>
<td>$726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculation</td>
<td>$49,176</td>
<td>$(52,627)</td>
<td>$52,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant and Instructional Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$(27,345)</td>
<td>$27,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Time Block Grant (QEIA)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$(10,000)</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Technical Ed. (QEIA moved to Prop. 98)</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td>$(10,000)</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Student Support Program Funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>441,486</strong></td>
<td><strong>(313,142)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$313,342</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Funding amounts still pending budget enactment.
TABLE 2: Budget Comparison 2008-09 to 2009-10*
(dollars in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUDGET ITEMS</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Apportionment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State General Fund</td>
<td>3,370,717</td>
<td>3,376,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Property Taxes</td>
<td>2,053,507</td>
<td>1,946,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Fee Revenue</td>
<td>299,440</td>
<td>367,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Revenue</td>
<td>9,226</td>
<td>10,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth for Apportionments</td>
<td>113,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal General Apportionment</strong></td>
<td>5,846,390</td>
<td>5,700,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Student Support Programs</strong></td>
<td>753,013</td>
<td>441,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total State Apportionment</strong></td>
<td>6,599,403</td>
<td>6,142,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Shortfall</td>
<td></td>
<td>-58,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Fee Shortfall</td>
<td></td>
<td>-21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$536 million or 8.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $126,000 in growth funding is anticipated in 2010-11, which means the 2010-11 total budget would equal $6.268 billion if the budget is passed with this augmentation.
** The year-to-year decline in community college funding totals $536 million. Of this amount, $457 million is displayed in the budget comparison chart above. In addition, another $79 million revenue shortfall results from a combination of property tax and student fee revenue shortfalls not being backfilled with state general fund dollars.
Summary Charts

This section provides various statewide budget charts and tables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior Year Balance</td>
<td>-$5,342</td>
<td>-$7,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues and Transfers</td>
<td>$90,687</td>
<td>$83,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Resources Available</td>
<td>$85,345</td>
<td>$76,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Proposition 98 Expenditures</td>
<td>$56,064</td>
<td>$56,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 98 Expenditures</td>
<td>$36,280</td>
<td>$34,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$92,723</td>
<td>$100,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
<td>-$7,448</td>
<td>-$24,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve for Liquidation of Encumbrances</td>
<td>$770</td>
<td>$770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Fund for Economic Uncertainties</td>
<td>-$8,218</td>
<td>-$25,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Stabilization Account</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available Reserve</td>
<td>-$8,218</td>
<td>-$25,454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure SUM-02
2011-12 Governor’s Budget
General Fund Budget Summary
With All Proposed Budget Solutions
(Dollars in Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior Year Balance</td>
<td>-$5,342</td>
<td>-$3,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues and Transfers</td>
<td>$94,194</td>
<td>$89,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Resources Available</td>
<td>$88,852</td>
<td>$86,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Proposition 98 Expenditures</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
<td>$48,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 98 Expenditures</td>
<td>$36,209</td>
<td>$36,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$92,209</td>
<td>$84,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
<td>-$3,357</td>
<td>1,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve for Liquidation of Encumbrances</td>
<td>$770</td>
<td>$770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Fund for Economic Uncertainties</td>
<td>-$4,127</td>
<td>$955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Stabilization Account</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available Reserve</td>
<td>-$4,127</td>
<td>$955</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure SUM-03

**General Fund Revenue Sources**

(Dollars in Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010-11 at Budget Act</th>
<th>Revised 2010-11</th>
<th>Proposed 2011-12</th>
<th>Change from Revised 2010-11</th>
<th>Dollar Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax</td>
<td>$47,127</td>
<td>$47,784</td>
<td>$48,741</td>
<td>$1,557</td>
<td>-2,659</td>
<td>-10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>27,044</td>
<td>26,709</td>
<td>24,050</td>
<td>-344</td>
<td>-344</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation Tax</td>
<td>10,897</td>
<td>11,509</td>
<td>10,666</td>
<td>-843</td>
<td>-843</td>
<td>-7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Fees</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>-1,321</td>
<td>-1,321</td>
<td>-87.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Tax</td>
<td>2,072</td>
<td>1,838</td>
<td>1,974</td>
<td>-136</td>
<td>-136</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate Taxes</td>
<td>782</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Tax</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco Taxes</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4,393</td>
<td>4,437</td>
<td>2,364</td>
<td>-2,073</td>
<td>-2,073</td>
<td>-46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$94,230</td>
<td>$94,194</td>
<td>$89,696</td>
<td>$-4,498</td>
<td>-4,498</td>
<td>-4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Numbers may not add due to rounding.*

### Figure SUM-04

**General Fund Expenditures by Agency**

(Dollars in Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010-11 at Budget Act</th>
<th>Revised 2010-11</th>
<th>Proposed 2011-12</th>
<th>Change from Revised 2010-11</th>
<th>Dollar Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislative, Judicial, Executive</td>
<td>$3,149</td>
<td>$3,157</td>
<td>$2,507</td>
<td>$-660</td>
<td>-660</td>
<td>-20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and Consumer Services</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, Transportation &amp; Housing</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>2,106</td>
<td>2,032</td>
<td>2,066</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Services</td>
<td>26,346</td>
<td>26,981</td>
<td>21,175</td>
<td>-5,786</td>
<td>-5,786</td>
<td>-21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections and Rehabilitation</td>
<td>8,931</td>
<td>9,257</td>
<td>9,165</td>
<td>-92</td>
<td>-92</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 Education</td>
<td>36,079</td>
<td>36,353</td>
<td>36,211</td>
<td>-142</td>
<td>-142</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>11,460</td>
<td>11,651</td>
<td>9,814</td>
<td>-1,837</td>
<td>-1,837</td>
<td>-15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor and Workforce Development</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>865.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Agency Departments</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Relief/Local Government</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Expenditures</td>
<td>-4,300</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>579.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$56,552</td>
<td>$92,209</td>
<td>$54,614</td>
<td>$-7,595</td>
<td>-7,595</td>
<td>-8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Numbers may not add due to rounding.*
Summary Charts

Figure SUM-09
2011-12
General Fund Expenditures
(Dollars in Millions)

- Corrections and Rehabilitation ($9,165) 10.8%
- Health and Human Services ($21,175) 25.0%
- Environmental Protection ($63) 0.1%
- Natural Resources ($2,066) 2.4%
- Business, Transportation & Housing ($691) 0.8%
- State and Consumer Services ($597) 0.7%
- Legislative, Judicial, Executive ($2,507) 3.0%
- K-12 Education ($38,211) 42.8%
- Higher Education ($9,814) 11.6%
- Labor and Workforce Development ($414) 0.5%
- General Government ($1,911) 2.3%

Figure SUM-10
2011-12 Total Expenditures by Agency
(Dollars in Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Special Funds</th>
<th>Bond Funds</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislative, Judicial, Executive</td>
<td>$2,507</td>
<td>$2,908</td>
<td>$339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and Consumer Services</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, Transportation &amp; Housing</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>7,567</td>
<td>4,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>2,066</td>
<td>2,323</td>
<td>809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Services</td>
<td>21,175</td>
<td>14,526</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections and Rehabilitation</td>
<td>9,165</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 Education</td>
<td>36,211</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>9,814</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor and Workforce Development</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Agency Departments</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Relief/Local Government</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>1,811</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Expenditures</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$84,614</td>
<td>$34,848</td>
<td>$7,909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges

The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges was established in 1967 to provide statewide leadership to California's community colleges. The Board has 17 members appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate. Twelve members are appointed to six-year terms and two student members, two faculty members, and one classified member are appointed to two-year terms.

The objectives of the Board are:

* To provide direction, coordination, planning, and leadership to California's community colleges.
* To promote quality education in community colleges.
* To improve district and campus programs through informational and technical services on a statewide basis, while recognizing the community-oriented aspect of California's network of 112 community colleges.
* To seek adequate financial support while ensuring the most prudent use of public funds.

Since community college programs drive the need for infrastructure investment, each community college district has a related capital outlay program to support this need. For the specifics on the community college capital outlay program see "Infrastructure Overview."

3-YR EXPENDITURES AND PERSONNEL YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Years</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Apportionments</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Special Services, Operations and Information</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.01 Administration</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.02 Distributed Administration</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS, POSITIONS AND EXPENDITURES (All Programs)</td>
<td>152.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUNDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0001 General Fund</td>
<td>$11,395</td>
<td>$28,779</td>
<td>$9,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001 General Fund, Proposition 98</td>
<td>3,752,931</td>
<td>3,884,676</td>
<td>3,541,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0342 State School Fund</td>
<td>7,202</td>
<td>7,202</td>
<td>7,202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range.
**Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges - Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING</th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0814 California State Lottery Education Fund</td>
<td>163,049</td>
<td>166,546</td>
<td>168,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0890 Federal Trust Fund</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>1,553</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0909 Community College Fund for Instructional Improvement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0929 California Community Colleges Business Resource Assistance and Innovation Network Trust Fund</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0942 Special Deposit Fund</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0986 Local Property Tax Revenues</td>
<td>1,599,799</td>
<td>1,892,117</td>
<td>1,873,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0992 Higher Education Fees and Income</td>
<td>363,574</td>
<td>350,065</td>
<td>456,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0995 Reimbursements</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>105,508</td>
<td>98,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3085 Mental Health Services Fund</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6041 2004 Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Fund</td>
<td>1,038</td>
<td>1,768</td>
<td>1,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6049 2006 California Community College Capital Outlay Bond Fund</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS, EXPENDITURES, ALL FUNDS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,445,322</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,441,028</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,158,362</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGAL CITATIONS AND AUTHORITY**

**DEPARTMENT AUTHORITY**

Education Code, Division 7.

---

**MAJOR PROGRAM CHANGES**

- A net decrease of $400 million Proposition 98 General Fund to apportionments is proposed, including reforms in census accounting practices.
- An increase of $110 million in student fee revenues as a result of increasing student fees from $26 to $36 per unit. The offsetting Proposition 98 General Fund savings is retained for growth funding to help preserve and expand course sections.
- A net increase of $52.7 million Proposition 98 General Fund is proposed to offset estimated decreases in local property taxes and oil and mineral revenues ($32.3 million) and student fee revenues ($18.7 million), as well as the increased costs to compensate colleges for the administration of fee waivers ($1.7 million) and financial aid.
- A one-time decrease of $129 million Proposition 98 General Fund is proposed reflecting an additional deferral of payments to 2012-13.

**DETAILED BUDGET ADJUSTMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workload Budget Adjustments</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>Other Funds</td>
<td>Personnel Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Compensation Adjustments</td>
<td>-$460</td>
<td>-$541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Rate Adjustment</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove Math and Science Teacher Initiative Funding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove Corrections and Rehabilitation Training Program Funding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove Solar Training Collaborative Program Funding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove One-Time State Fiscal Stabilization Funding (ARRA)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove One-Time Allied Health Funding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove One-Time Energy Sustainability Plan Funding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program Funding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range.
### Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
<th>Personnel Years</th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
<th>Personnel Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add Proposition 98 Reversion Account for Career Technical Education</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise Property Tax Revenues</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-14,731</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33,376</td>
<td>-33,376</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise Federal Oil and Mineral Revenues</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-1,052</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise Student Fee Revenues</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-15,176</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,677</td>
<td>-18,677</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise Lottery Revenues</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,380</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,380</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise Financial Aid Administrative Support</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Apportionment Deferral</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>129,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Adjustments</td>
<td>-9,545</td>
<td>-2,742</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease Revenue Debt Service Adjustments</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-5,089</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Cap Adjustment</td>
<td>-407</td>
<td>-347</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-407</td>
<td>-347</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals, Other Workload Budget Adjustments</strong></td>
<td>$9,702</td>
<td>-$19,933</td>
<td>-$176,292</td>
<td>$50,324</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals, Workload Budget Adjustments</strong></td>
<td>$9,702</td>
<td>-$19,933</td>
<td>-$176,292</td>
<td>$50,324</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Policy Adjustments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
<th>Personnel Years</th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
<th>Personnel Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Apportionments and Census Date Reform</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>-$400,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Student Fee Revenues</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-110,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Apportionment Growth Funding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Apportionment Deferral</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-129,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Personal Care Certification Program Funding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augment State Operations for Bond Audits</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals, Policy Adjustments</strong></td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>-$529,000</td>
<td>$110,884</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals, Budget Adjustments</strong></td>
<td>$9,702</td>
<td>-$19,183</td>
<td>-$352,708</td>
<td>$60,560</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

#### 10 - APPORTIONMENTS

This program provides funding that supplements local resources in financing the general education programs of the 112 community colleges. This program also includes the preparation of reports and the collection of a wide range of data from community colleges for certification of the funding provided to each district. The majority of state funding for community colleges is provided by the General Fund.

#### 20 - SPECIAL SERVICES, OPERATIONS AND INFORMATION

Special Services, Operations and Information functions include the development, implementation, and coordination of policies and procedures regarding education programs and funding other than apportionments. Such programs include student financial aid, academic counseling, foster care education, and support for disabled students and CalWORKs participants.

#### 30 - ADMINISTRATION

A total of 43 positions and $5.9 million will be utilized by the Chancellor's Office during the 2011-12 fiscal year to perform administrative functions for support of the various programs of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges.

### DETAILED EXPENDITURES BY PROGRAM

#### PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

#### 10 APPORTIONMENTS

**State Operations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0001 General Fund</td>
<td>$1,020</td>
<td>$1,216</td>
<td>$1,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals, State Operations</strong></td>
<td>$1,020</td>
<td>$1,216</td>
<td>$1,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Assistance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001 General Fund</td>
<td>$3,321,543</td>
<td>$3,495,544</td>
<td>$3,151,028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range.
| 6870  Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges - Continued |
|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                                 | 2009-10*       | 2010-11*       | 2011-12*       |
| 0342  State School Fund         | 7,202          | 7,202          | 7,202          |
| 0814  California State Lottery Education Fund | 163,049       | 168,546       | 168,546       |
| 0986  Local Property Tax Revenues | 1,999,769     | 1,892,117     | 1,873,472     |
| 0992  Higher Education Fees and Income | 353,574       | 350,065       | 456,686       |
| 0995  Reimbursements            | 51,872         | 13,021         | 8,001          |
| **Totals, Local Assistance**   | **$5,897,109** | **$5,926,495** | **$5,664,815** |

**ELEMENT REQUIREMENTS**

10.10 010-Apportionments

State Operations:

0001 General Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,216</td>
<td>1,231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Assistance:

0001 General Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3,314,369</th>
<th>3,362,370</th>
<th>3,033,854</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0342  State School Fund</td>
<td>7,202</td>
<td>7,202</td>
<td>7,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0814  California State Lottery Education Fund</td>
<td>163,049</td>
<td>168,546</td>
<td>168,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0986  Local Property Tax Revenues</td>
<td>1,999,769</td>
<td>1,892,117</td>
<td>1,873,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0992  Higher Education Fees and Income</td>
<td>353,574</td>
<td>350,065</td>
<td>456,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0995  Reimbursements</td>
<td>51,872</td>
<td>13,021</td>
<td>8,001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**10.10 020-Apprenticeship**

Local Assistance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,174</td>
<td>7,174</td>
<td>7,174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**10.10 030-Growth for Apportionments**

Local Assistance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0001  General Fund</td>
<td>$126,000</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS**

20  SPECIAL SERVICES, OPERATIONS AND INFORMATION

State Operations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0001  General Fund</td>
<td>$7,450</td>
<td>$8,270</td>
<td>$8,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0890  Federal Trust Fund</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0909  Community College Fund for Instructional Improvement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0925  California Community Colleges Business Resource Assistance and Innovation Network Trust Fund</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0942  Special Deposit Fund</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0955  Reimbursements</td>
<td>6,980</td>
<td>9,076</td>
<td>9,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3085  Mental Health Services Fund</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6041  2004 Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Fund</td>
<td>1,638</td>
<td>1,788</td>
<td>1,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6049  2006 California Community College Capital Outlay Bond Fund</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals, State Operations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$16,612</td>
<td>$19,653</td>
<td>$20,470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Assistance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0001  General Fund</td>
<td>$434,313</td>
<td>$408,425</td>
<td>$300,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0890  Federal Trust Fund</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0909  Community College Fund for Instructional Improvement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0925  California Community Colleges Business Resource Assistance and Innovation Network Trust Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0995  Reimbursements</td>
<td>$86,048</td>
<td>$83,809</td>
<td>$80,957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals, Local Assistance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$530,551</td>
<td>$492,234</td>
<td>$471,816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ELEMENT REQUIREMENTS**

20.10 004-Student Success for Basic Skills Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$20,037</td>
<td>$20,037</td>
<td>$20,037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Assistance:</th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0001 General Fund</td>
<td>$20,037</td>
<td>$20,037</td>
<td>$20,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.10 005-Student Financial Aid Administration Local Assistance:</td>
<td>$52,884</td>
<td>$54,695</td>
<td>$56,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001 General Fund</td>
<td>52,884</td>
<td>54,695</td>
<td>56,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.10 010-Extended Opportunity Programs and Services and Special Services Local Assistance:</td>
<td>$73,605</td>
<td>$73,605</td>
<td>$73,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001 General Fund</td>
<td>73,605</td>
<td>73,605</td>
<td>73,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.10 020-Disabled Students Local Assistance:</td>
<td>$69,223</td>
<td>$69,223</td>
<td>$69,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001 General Fund</td>
<td>69,223</td>
<td>69,223</td>
<td>69,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.10 045-Student Services for CalWORKs Recipients Local Assistance:</td>
<td>$26,685</td>
<td>$26,685</td>
<td>$26,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001 General Fund</td>
<td>26,685</td>
<td>26,685</td>
<td>26,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.10 060-Foster Care Education Program State Operations:</td>
<td>$10,855</td>
<td>$11,786</td>
<td>$11,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0995 Reimbursements</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001 General Fund</td>
<td>5,254</td>
<td>5,254</td>
<td>5,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0995 Reimbursements</td>
<td>5,258</td>
<td>6,112</td>
<td>6,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.10 070-Matriculation Local Assistance:</td>
<td>$49,183</td>
<td>$49,183</td>
<td>$49,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001 General Fund</td>
<td>49,183</td>
<td>49,183</td>
<td>49,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.10 080-Student Services Administration State Operations:</td>
<td>$2,565</td>
<td>$3,023</td>
<td>$3,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001 General Fund</td>
<td>2,341</td>
<td>2,654</td>
<td>2,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3085 Mental Health Services Fund</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0995 Reimbursements</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.10 090-Special Services State Operations:</td>
<td>$1,013</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0995 Reimbursements</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.20 020-Academic Senate for the Community Colleges State Operations:</td>
<td>$353</td>
<td>$338</td>
<td>$338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001 General Fund</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Assistance:</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.20 040-Student and Faculty Diversity State Operations:</td>
<td>$189</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001 General Fund</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.20 041-Equal Employment Opportunity Local Assistance:</td>
<td>$767</td>
<td>$767</td>
<td>$767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001 General Fund</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.20 050-Part-time Faculty Health Insurance Local Assistance:</td>
<td>$490</td>
<td>$490</td>
<td>$490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001 General Fund</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.20 051-Part-time Faculty Compensation Local Assistance:</td>
<td>$24,907</td>
<td>$24,907</td>
<td>$24,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001 General Fund</td>
<td>24,907</td>
<td>24,907</td>
<td>24,907</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20.20</th>
<th>055-Part-time Faculty Office Hours</th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Assistance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>3,514</td>
<td>3,514</td>
<td>3,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.30</td>
<td>011-Telecommunications and Technology Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Assistance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>15,290</td>
<td>15,290</td>
<td>15,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.30</td>
<td>020-Instructional Improvement</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Operations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0809</td>
<td>Community College Fund for Instructional Improvement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.30</td>
<td>030-Vocational Education</td>
<td>$73,859</td>
<td>$77,827</td>
<td>$76,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Operations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>2,162</td>
<td>2,325</td>
<td>2,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0942</td>
<td>Special Deposit Fund</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0695</td>
<td>Reimbursements</td>
<td>3,441</td>
<td>4,255</td>
<td>4,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Assistance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0695</td>
<td>Reimbursements</td>
<td>68,130</td>
<td>71,092</td>
<td>71,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.30</td>
<td>045-Fund for Student Success</td>
<td>$3,792</td>
<td>$3,792</td>
<td>$3,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Assistance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>3,792</td>
<td>3,792</td>
<td>3,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.30</td>
<td>050-Economic Development</td>
<td>$45,043</td>
<td>$29,559</td>
<td>$26,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Operations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0625</td>
<td>California Community Colleges Business Resource Assistance and Innovation Network Trust Fund</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0695</td>
<td>Reimbursements</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Assistance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>22,929</td>
<td>22,929</td>
<td>22,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0625</td>
<td>California Community Colleges Business Resource Assistance and Innovation Network Trust Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0695</td>
<td>Reimbursements</td>
<td>22,660</td>
<td>6,339</td>
<td>3,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.30</td>
<td>060-Workforce Preparation</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Operations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0695</td>
<td>Reimbursements</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.30</td>
<td>070-Transfer Education and Articulation</td>
<td>$698</td>
<td>$698</td>
<td>$698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Assistance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.30</td>
<td>080-Curriculum Standards and Instructional Services</td>
<td>$953</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$1,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Operations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>010-Facilities Planning</td>
<td>$2,292</td>
<td>$2,983</td>
<td>$3,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Operations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0695</td>
<td>Reimbursements</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6041</td>
<td>2004 Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Fund</td>
<td>1,638</td>
<td>1,788</td>
<td>1,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6049</td>
<td>2006 California Community College Capital Outlay Bond Fund</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>100-PVEA Energy Commission</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$266</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Assistance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0695</td>
<td>Reimbursements</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range.
# Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>000-MIS and Operations Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>1,769</td>
<td>1,921</td>
<td>2,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0995</td>
<td>Reimbursements</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.60</td>
<td>010-Homeland Security</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0995</td>
<td>Reimbursements</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.70</td>
<td>010-Career Technical Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0995</td>
<td>Reimbursements</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.80</td>
<td>010-Campus Childcare Tax Bailout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td>3,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.95</td>
<td>010-Nursing Program Support</td>
<td>13,378</td>
<td>13,378</td>
<td>13,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>13,378</td>
<td>13,378</td>
<td>13,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.97</td>
<td>001-Community College Logistics Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0890</td>
<td>Federal Trust Fund</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.98</td>
<td>001-Math Science Teacher Initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0890</td>
<td>Federal Trust Fund</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0890</td>
<td>Federal Trust Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.99</td>
<td>002-Solar Training Collaborative Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0890</td>
<td>Federal Trust Fund</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0890</td>
<td>Federal Trust Fund</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.99</td>
<td>003-Personal Care Training and Certification Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0890</td>
<td>Federal Trust Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0890</td>
<td>Federal Trust Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS, EXPENDITURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State Operations</th>
<th>Local Assistance</th>
<th>Totals, Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17,532</td>
<td>20,869</td>
<td>21,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,427,890</td>
<td>6,420,159</td>
<td>6,136,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$6,445,322</td>
<td>$6,441,028</td>
<td>$6,158,362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPENDITURES BY CATEGORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Positions/Personnel Years</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-10*</td>
<td>2010-11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorized Positions ( Equals Sch. 7A)</td>
<td>152.9</td>
<td>163.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Adjustments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Salary Savings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-15.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range.
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1 State Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions/Personnel Years</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Totals, Salaries and Wages</td>
<td>152.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Benefits</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals, Personal Services</td>
<td>152.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OPERATING EXPENSES AND EQUIPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Subventions</td>
<td>$5,427,690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS, EXPENDITURES, ALL FUNDS (State Operations)

$17,632   $20,869   $21,731

2 Local Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Subventions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DETAIL OF APPROPRIATIONS AND ADJUSTMENTS

1 STATE OPERATIONS

APPROPRIATIONS

0001 General Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations</th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001 Budget Act appropriation as amended by Chapter 1, Statutes of 2009, Fourth Extraordinary</td>
<td>$10,155</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment per Section 3.60</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction per Section 3.80</td>
<td>-995</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment per Section 4.04</td>
<td>-80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment per Section 3.55</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001 Budget Act appropriation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$10,204</td>
<td>$9,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation for employee compensation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment per Section 3.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction per Section 3.80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-407</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction per Control Section 3.91</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-488</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals Available</td>
<td>$9,095</td>
<td>$9,486</td>
<td>$9,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexpended balance, estimated savings</td>
<td>-625</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS, EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>$5,470</td>
<td>$9,486</td>
<td>$9,848</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0800 Federal Trust Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations</th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001 Budget Act appropriation</td>
<td>$36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002 Budget Act appropriation as amended by Chapter 1, Statutes of 2009, Fourth Extraordinary</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction per Section 3.80</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Adjustment</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002 Budget Act appropriation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003 Budget Act appropriation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Adjustment</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior year balances available:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6870-002-0890 Budget Act of 2008, as reappropriated by Item 6870-493, Budget Act of 2009</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Adjustment</td>
<td>-49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS, EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>$123</td>
<td>$138</td>
<td>$83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0909 Community College Fund for Instructional Improvement

*Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE OPERATIONS</th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPROPRIATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001 Budget Act appropriation</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction per Section 3.90</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS, EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0925</strong> California Community Colleges Business Resource Assistance and Innovation Network Trust Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROPRIATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001 Budget Act appropriation</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>$11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction per Section 3.90</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals Available</strong></td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>$11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexpended balance, estimated savings</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS, EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>$11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0942</strong> Special Deposit Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROPRIATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Code Section 16370</td>
<td></td>
<td>$126</td>
<td>$155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS, EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$126</td>
<td>$155</td>
<td>$155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0985</strong> Reimbursements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROPRIATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursements</td>
<td>$8,980</td>
<td>$9,078</td>
<td>$9,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3085</strong> Mental Health Services Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROPRIATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003 Budget Act appropriation</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation for employee compensation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment per Section 3.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction per Section 3.90</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction per Control Section 3.91</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS, EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$158</td>
<td>$212</td>
<td>$216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6041</strong> 2004 Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROPRIATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001 Budget Act appropriation</td>
<td>$1,866</td>
<td>$1,899</td>
<td>$1,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation for employee compensation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment per Section 3.60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction per Section 3.90</td>
<td>-184</td>
<td>-53</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction per Control Section 3.91</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-91</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals Available</strong></td>
<td>$1,715</td>
<td>$1,788</td>
<td>$1,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexpended balance, estimated savings</td>
<td>-77</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS, EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$1,638</td>
<td>$1,788</td>
<td>$1,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6049</strong> 2006 California Community College Capital Outlay Bond Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROPRIATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001 Budget Act appropriation</td>
<td>$128</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction per Section 3.90</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS, EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$116</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS, EXPENDITURES, ALL FUNDS (State Operations)</strong></td>
<td>$17,632</td>
<td>$20,869</td>
<td>$21,731</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2 LOCAL ASSISTANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0001 General Fund, Proposition 98</th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPROPRIATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 Budget Act appropriation as amended by Chapter 1, Statutes of 2009, Fourth Extraordinary Session</td>
<td>$3,114,494</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 Budget Act appropriation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$3,112,276</td>
<td>$2,638,024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL ASSISTANCE</th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103 Budget Act appropriation as amended by Chapter 1, Statutes of 2009, Fourth Extraordinary Session</td>
<td>66,829</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment per Section 4.30</td>
<td>-663</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 Budget Act appropriation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68,866</td>
<td>63,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment per Section 4.30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107 Budget Act appropriation</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295 Budget Act appropriation (State Mandates) as amended by Chapter 1, Statutes of 2009, Fourth Extraordinary Session</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295 Budget Act appropriation (State Mandates)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,545</td>
<td>9,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 724, Statutes of 2010, Section 14(A) State Mandates Proposition 98 Setloup Funding</td>
<td>9,545</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 724, Statutes of 2010 (Section 31 (b))</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>832,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 757, Statutes of 2008 Section 35</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 12, Statutes of 2009 Section 40</td>
<td>340,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 23, Statutes of 2009, Fourth Extraordinary Session, Section 19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>703,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 724, Statutes of 2010, Section 14(A) State Mandates Proposition 98 Setloup Funding</td>
<td>22,307</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Allocated to Community Colleges to Pay for Mandates</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-9,545</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals Available</strong></td>
<td>$3,753,085</td>
<td>$3,884,676</td>
<td>$3,541,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexpended balance, estimated savings</td>
<td>-154</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS, EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$3,752,931</td>
<td>$3,884,676</td>
<td>$3,541,906</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPROPRIATIONS 0001 General Fund**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>111 Budget Act appropriation as amended by Chapter 1, Statutes of 2009, Fourth Extraordinary Session</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 Budget Act appropriation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate per Item 6110-485, Budget Act of 2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 221, Statutes of 2010 Sec. (b)(2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior year balances available:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6870-101-0001, Budget Act of 2008 as reapportioned by Item 6870-492, Budget Act of 2009</td>
<td>$3,722</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS, EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$3,722</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan repayment per Education Code Section 41329.52</td>
<td>-797</td>
<td>-707</td>
<td>-707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET TOTALS, EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$2,925</td>
<td>$19,293</td>
<td>-$707</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPROPRIATIONS 0342 State School Fund**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Article 16, Section 8.5, California State Constitution</td>
<td>$3,853,361</td>
<td>$3,970,408</td>
<td>$3,618,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Code Section 12320 (Federal Oil and Mineral Revenue)</td>
<td>7,202</td>
<td>7,202</td>
<td>7,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS, EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$3,860,563</td>
<td>$3,977,608</td>
<td>$3,625,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less funding provided by the General Fund</td>
<td>-3,853,361</td>
<td>-3,970,408</td>
<td>-3,618,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET TOTALS, EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$7,202</td>
<td>$7,202</td>
<td>$7,202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPROPRIATIONS 0314 California State Lottery Education Fund**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government Code Section 8880.5</td>
<td>$163,049</td>
<td>$168,546</td>
<td>$168,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS, EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$163,049</td>
<td>$168,546</td>
<td>$168,546</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPROPRIATIONS 0890 Federal Trust Fund**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101 Budget Act appropriation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$718</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 Budget Act appropriation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS, EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$1,415</td>
<td>$673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPROPRIATIONS 0909 Community College Fund for Instructional Improvement**

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range.
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#### LOCAL ASSISTANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101 Budget Act appropriation</td>
<td>$302</td>
<td>$302</td>
<td>$302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals Available</td>
<td>$302</td>
<td>$302</td>
<td>$302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexpended balance, estimated savings</td>
<td>-302</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS, EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$302</td>
<td>$302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Repayments from Community College Districts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-302</td>
<td>-302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET TOTALS, EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**0925 California Community Colleges Business Resource Assistance and Innovation Network Trust Fund**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101 Budget Act appropriation</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals Available</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexpended balance, estimated savings</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS, EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**0986 Local Property Tax Revenues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Property Tax Revenue (amount counted toward apportionments)</td>
<td>$1,999,769</td>
<td>$1,892,117</td>
<td>$1,873,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS, EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$1,999,769</td>
<td>$1,892,117</td>
<td>$1,873,472</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**0992 Higher Education Fees and Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Fee Revenue (amount counted toward apportionments)</td>
<td>$353,574</td>
<td>$350,065</td>
<td>$456,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS, EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$353,574</td>
<td>$350,065</td>
<td>$456,666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**0995 Reimbursements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursements</td>
<td>$148,020</td>
<td>$96,830</td>
<td>$88,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS, EXPENDITURES, ALL FUNDS (Local Assistance)</strong></td>
<td>$6,427,690</td>
<td>$6,420,159</td>
<td>$6,136,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS, EXPENDITURES, ALL FUNDS (State Operations and Local Assistance)</strong></td>
<td>$6,445,322</td>
<td>$6,441,028</td>
<td>$6,158,362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CHANGES IN AUTHORIZED POSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions/Personnel Years</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totals, Authorized Positions</td>
<td>162.9</td>
<td>163.3</td>
<td>163.3</td>
<td>9,997</td>
<td>12,456</td>
<td>12,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furlough Adjustments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP Adjustments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-374</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workload and Administrative Adjustments:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Salary Range</strong></td>
<td><strong>-67</strong></td>
<td><strong>-67</strong></td>
<td><strong>-134</strong></td>
<td><strong>-134</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reductions in Authorized Positions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services/Special Programs Division:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College Program Assistant II</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>5,724-6,954</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs Division:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Academic Planner</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>5,724-6,954</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals, Workload &amp; Admin Adjustments</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Adjustments</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS, SALARIES AND WAGES</strong></td>
<td>152.9</td>
<td>163.3</td>
<td>161.3</td>
<td>9,997</td>
<td>11,660</td>
<td>12,501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### INFRASTRUCTURE OVERVIEW

The California Community Colleges (CCC) comprise the largest postsecondary system of education in the world. The CCC system served over 2.8 million students during academic year 2009-10 at 72 districts encompassing 112 campuses; 68 approved off-campus centers and 22 separately reported district offices. These assets include 25,151 acres of land, 4,982 buildings and 68 million gross square feet of space that includes 45.3 million assignable square feet. The system also holds classes at innumerable off-campus outreach centers.

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY OF PROJECTS</th>
<th>State Building Program Expenditures</th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>CAPITAL OUTLAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.02</td>
<td>ALLAN HANCOCK COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$15,020</td>
<td>$71</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.02.118</td>
<td>Allan Hancock College—One-Stop Student Services Center</td>
<td>15,020&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>71&lt;sup&gt;ib&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.03</td>
<td>ANTELOPE VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$20,405</td>
<td>$15,217</td>
<td>$1,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.03.114</td>
<td>Antelope Valley College—Theatre Arts Facility</td>
<td>648&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.03.115</td>
<td>Antelope Valley College—Health and Science Building</td>
<td>19,767&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>15,217&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,716&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.04</td>
<td>BARSTOW COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$18,452</td>
<td>$1,773</td>
<td>$8,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.04.104</td>
<td>Barstow College—Performing Arts Center</td>
<td>18,452&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,773&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.04.105</td>
<td>Barstow College—Wellness Center</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,722&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.08</td>
<td>CABRILLO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$1,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.08.113</td>
<td>Cabrillo College—Visual Arts Reconstruction (Building 300)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,904&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.07</td>
<td>CERRITOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$8,734</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.07.121</td>
<td>Cerritos College—Gymnasium Seismic Retrofit</td>
<td>8,734&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.08</td>
<td>CHAFFEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$5,838</td>
<td>$455</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.08.201</td>
<td>Ralph M. Lewis Fontana Center—Fontana Center Phase III, Academic Building</td>
<td>5,838&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>455&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.09</td>
<td>CITRUS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.09.126</td>
<td>Citrus College—Student Services Building</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>407&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.11</td>
<td>COAST COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$736</td>
<td>$19</td>
<td>$3,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.11.312</td>
<td>Orange Coast College—Consumer and Science Laboratory Building</td>
<td>393&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>19&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.11.313</td>
<td>Orange Coast College—Music Building Modernization</td>
<td>343&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,489&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.14</td>
<td>EL CAMINO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$3,444</td>
<td>$32,633</td>
<td>$24,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.14.115</td>
<td>El Camino College—Social Science Remodel for Efficiency</td>
<td>2,404&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2,718&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>135&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.14.116</td>
<td>El Camino College—Infrastructure Replacement Phase 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29,480&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.14.202</td>
<td>El Camino College—Infrastructure Replacement Phase 2</td>
<td>1,040&lt;sup&gt;mb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16,206&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.14.203</td>
<td>El Camino College—Allied Health Building</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>435&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8,511&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.16</td>
<td>OHLONE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$268</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$15,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.16.113</td>
<td>Ohlone College—Below Grade Water Infusion Repair</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,172&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.16.114</td>
<td>Ohlone College—Fire Suppression</td>
<td>268&lt;sup&gt;mb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,257&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.17</td>
<td>GAVILAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$6,590</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.17.111</td>
<td>Gavilan College—Replace Water Supply System</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,590&lt;sup&gt;PRCo&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.19</td>
<td>GROSSMONT-CUYAMACA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$2,048</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.19.118</td>
<td>Cuyamaca College—Business/Computer Information Systems Building</td>
<td>349&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.19.119</td>
<td>Cuyamaca College—Learning Resource Center Expansion/Remodel, Phase I</td>
<td>1,462&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>127&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.19.210</td>
<td>Grossmont College—Health Sciences Building</td>
<td>1,017&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.20</td>
<td>HARTNELL COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$1,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.20.103</td>
<td>Hartnell East Campus—Center for Applied Technology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,546&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.21</td>
<td>IMPERIAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$209</td>
<td>$2,195</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.21.105</td>
<td>Imperial Valley College—Building 400 Modernization</td>
<td>209&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2,195&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.22</td>
<td>KERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$1,637</td>
<td>$10,286</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.22.112</td>
<td>Bakersfield College—Performing Arts Modernization</td>
<td>1,637&lt;sup&gt;PRCo&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10,286&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.25</td>
<td>LONG BEACH COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$15,793</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.25.117</td>
<td>Long Beach City College, Pacific Coast Campus—Multi-Disciplinary Academic Building</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,793&lt;sup&gt;eb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.26</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$26,033</td>
<td>$17,975</td>
<td>$31,029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dollars In thousands, except in Salary Range.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Building Program</th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40.26.107 East Los Angeles College--Fine and Performing Arts Center</td>
<td>2,824&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.26.109 East Los Angeles College--Bailey Library Modernization/Addition</td>
<td>5,239&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>729&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.26.209 Los Angeles City College--Jefferson Hall Modernization</td>
<td>3,489&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>193&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.26.303 Los Angeles Harbor College--Adaptive Physical Education and Physical Education Building Renovation</td>
<td>285&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.26.305 Los Angeles Harbor College--Library/Learning Resource Center</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,649&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.26.411 Los Angeles Mission College--Media Arts Center</td>
<td>10,340&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>382&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.26.413 Los Angeles Mission College--Culinary Arts Center</td>
<td>805&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>457&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.26.505 Los Angeles Pierce College--Child Development Center</td>
<td>400&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.26.510 Los Angeles Pierce College--Physical Education Building Renovation</td>
<td>323&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.26.705 Los Angeles Trade-Tech College--Learning Assistance Center Renovation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,240&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.26.804 Los Angeles Valley College--Child Development Center</td>
<td>442&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.26.805 Los Angeles Valley College--Library/Learning Assistance Center</td>
<td>1,886&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9,139&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2,176&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.27 LOS RIOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$17,276</td>
<td>$13,617</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.27.106 American River College--Library Expansion</td>
<td>3,216&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.27.108 American River College--Life Science and Fine Arts Modernization</td>
<td>126&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6,690&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.27.214 Cosumnes River College--North East Building Modernization</td>
<td>178&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6,021&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.27.313 Sacramento City College--Performing Arts Modernization</td>
<td>13,754&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.31 MIRA COSTA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$1,983</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.31.112 Mira Costa College--Campus-wide Fire Line Replacement</td>
<td>1,933&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.32 MONTEREY PENINSULA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$182</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$4,485&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.32.107 Monterey Peninsula College--Modernize Humanities, Business, and Student Services Buildings</td>
<td>182&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,485&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.33 MT. SAN ANTONIO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$14,126</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>$1,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.33.114 Mt. San Antonio College--Agriculture Sciences Complex</td>
<td>68&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.33.116 Mt. San Antonio College--Design and Online Tech Center</td>
<td>8,427&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,236&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.33.117 Mt. San Antonio College--Administration Building Remodel</td>
<td>5,631&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>115&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.34 MT. SAN JACINTO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$13,142</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.34.213 Menifee Valley Center--General Classroom Building</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,142&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.35 NAPA VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$3,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.35.104 Napa Valley College--Library/Learning Resource Center</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,869&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.36 NORTH ORANGE COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$34,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.36.204 Fullerton College--Technology and Engineering Complex</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34,255&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.37 PALO VERDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$1,002</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$1,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.37.104 Palo Verde College--Fine and Performing Arts</td>
<td>1,002&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.37.200 Needles Center--Needles Center Equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,664&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.38 PALOMAR COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$2,939</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.38.114 Palomar College--Multi-Disciplinary Building</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,939&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.41 RANCHO SANTIAGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$867</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.41.201 Santiago Canyon College--Science Building</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>867&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.42 REDWOODS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$16,137</td>
<td>$26,937</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.42.105 College of the Redwoods--Student Services/Administration and Performing Arts Building</td>
<td>15,027&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.42.107 College of the Redwoods--New Science/Humanities Building Seismic Replacement</td>
<td>1,110&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>26,937&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.43 RIO HONDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$14,425</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$5,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.43.109 Rio Hondo College--Physical Education Facilities</td>
<td>14,425&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,654&lt;sup&gt;eh&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Building Program</th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.44</td>
<td>RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$49,589</td>
<td>$14,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.44.104</td>
<td>Riverside College--Nursing/Science Building</td>
<td>40,622&lt;sup&gt;Cb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.44.105</td>
<td>Riverside College--Wheelock Gymnasium Seismic Retrofit</td>
<td>8,768&lt;sup&gt;Cb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.44.208</td>
<td>Moreno Valley Center--Phase III Student Academic Services Building</td>
<td>199&lt;sup&gt;Cb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>14,902&lt;sup&gt;Cb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTHWEST COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.45</td>
<td>SOUTHWEST COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$13,199</td>
<td>$15,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.45.131</td>
<td>Irvine Valley College--Life Sciences Building</td>
<td>682&lt;sup&gt;Cb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>15,386&lt;sup&gt;Cb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.45.217</td>
<td>Saddleback College--Learning Resource Center Renovation</td>
<td>12,517&lt;sup&gt;Cb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAN BERNARDINO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.46</td>
<td>SAN BERNARDINO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$23,587</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.46.106</td>
<td>Crafton Hills College--Learning Resource/Technology Center</td>
<td>1,000&lt;sup&gt;Cb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.46.217</td>
<td>San Bernardino Valley College--Chemistry and Physical Science Seismic Replacement</td>
<td>22,567&lt;sup&gt;Cb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.48</td>
<td>SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$41,215</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.48.107</td>
<td>City College of San Francisco, Phelan Campus--Joint Use Instructional Facility</td>
<td>29,622&lt;sup&gt;Cb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.48.113</td>
<td>City College of San Francisco, Performing Arts Complex</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.48.301</td>
<td>City College of San Francisco, Chinatown Center--Campus Building</td>
<td>11,688&lt;sup&gt;Cb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAN JOAQUIN DELTA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.49</td>
<td>SAN JOAQUIN DELTA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$940</td>
<td>$804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.49.108</td>
<td>San Joaquin Delta College--Goleman Learning Resource Center Modernization</td>
<td>940&lt;sup&gt;Cb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.49.109</td>
<td>San Joaquin Delta College--Cunningham Math/Science Replacement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>804&lt;sup&gt;Cb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.51</td>
<td>SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$15,695</td>
<td>$9,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.51.201</td>
<td>North County Center--Learning Resource Center</td>
<td>15,695&lt;sup&gt;Cb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,574&lt;sup&gt;Cb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.51.202</td>
<td>North County Center--Technology and Trades Complex</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,819&lt;sup&gt;Cb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAN MATEO COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.52</td>
<td>SAN MATEO COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$4,249</td>
<td>$4,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.52.105</td>
<td>Canada College--Reconstruction of Academic Facilities</td>
<td>3,990&lt;sup&gt;Cb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.52.108</td>
<td>Canada College--Electrical Infrastructure Replacement</td>
<td>185&lt;sup&gt;Cb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3,653&lt;sup&gt;Wc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.52.208</td>
<td>College of San Mateo--Demolition of Seismic Hazardous Buildings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.52.314</td>
<td>Skyline College--Electrical Infrastructure Replacement</td>
<td>74&lt;sup&gt;Cb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,279&lt;sup&gt;Wc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SANTA BARBARA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.53</td>
<td>SANTA BARBARA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$332</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.53.123</td>
<td>Santa Barbara City College--Drama/Music Building Modernization</td>
<td>332&lt;sup&gt;Cb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SANTA CLARITA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.54</td>
<td>SANTA CLARITA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$143</td>
<td>$93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.54.116</td>
<td>College of the Canyons--Library Addition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.54.117</td>
<td>College of the Canyons--Administration/Student Services</td>
<td>143&lt;sup&gt;Cb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>93&lt;sup&gt;Wc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SANTA MONICA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.55</td>
<td>SANTA MONICA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.55.110</td>
<td>Santa Monica College--Student Services and Administration Building</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEQUOIAS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.56</td>
<td>SEQUOIAS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$41,523</td>
<td>$5,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.56.111</td>
<td>College of the Sequoias--Physical Education and Disabled Program Center</td>
<td>334&lt;sup&gt;Cb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.56.116</td>
<td>College of the Sequoias--Administration Building Remodel for Efficiency</td>
<td>603&lt;sup&gt;Wc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5,177&lt;sup&gt;Cb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.56.200</td>
<td>Tulare Center--Phase I Site Development and Facilities</td>
<td>40,586&lt;sup&gt;Cb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SISKIYOU JOINT COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.59</td>
<td>SISKIYOU JOINT COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$596</td>
<td>$13,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.59.104</td>
<td>College of the Siskiyous--Science Complex Modernization</td>
<td>596&lt;sup&gt;Mb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>13,215&lt;sup&gt;Cb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SONOMA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.61</td>
<td>SONOMA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.61.401</td>
<td>Santa Rosa Junior College--Public Safety Training Center Advanced Lab and Office Complex</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHABOT--LAS POSITAS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.62</td>
<td>CHABOT--LAS POSITAS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$183</td>
<td>$9,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.62.116</td>
<td>Chabot College--Math-Science Modernization</td>
<td>163&lt;sup&gt;Wc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9,402&lt;sup&gt;Cb&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE CENTER COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.64</td>
<td>STATE CENTER COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$153</td>
<td>$9,235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Building Program Expenditures</th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40.64.109 Fresno City College-Old Administration Building, North and East Wings, Phase III</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.64.501 Willow International Center-Academic Facilities, Phase II</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>668th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.65 VENTURA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$572</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.65.113 Moorpark College-Health Science Expansion/Replacement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>583th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.65.207 Oxnard College-Performing Arts Center (CCTV) Auditorium</td>
<td>572th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.67 WEST HILLS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$9,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.67.104 West Hills College at Calexico-Wellness Center</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>105th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.67.105 West Hills College at Calexico-Agricultural Science Facility</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,400th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.67.206 West Hills College at Lemore-Multi-Use Sports Complex</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>393th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.68 WEST KERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$13,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.68.104 Taft College-Tech Arts Modernization</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,109th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.68.105 Taft College-Transition to Independent Living (TIL) Center</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,860th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.69 WEST VALLEY-MISSION COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$14,856</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$4,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.69.110 West Valley College-Science and Math Building Renovation</td>
<td>14,172th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,303th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.69.301 District-wide-Fire Alarm System Replacement</td>
<td>684th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.71 YUBA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$877</td>
<td>$10,211</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.71.111 Yuba College-Building 1100 Learning Resource Center Renovation</td>
<td>877th</td>
<td>10,211th</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.72 COPPER MOUNTAIN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$5,024</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.72.101 Copper Mountain College-Remodel for Efficiency</td>
<td>5,024th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>469th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.73 FEATHER RIVER COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT</td>
<td>$935</td>
<td>$723</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.73.105 Feather River College-Learning Resource Center and Technology Building</td>
<td>935th</td>
<td>723th</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals, Major Projects</strong></td>
<td>$382,383</td>
<td>$254,091</td>
<td>$329,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS, EXPENDITURES, ALL PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td>$382,383</td>
<td>$254,091</td>
<td>$329,407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING</th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0658 1996 Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$11,873</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0705 Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Fund of 1992</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0785 1988 Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Fund</td>
<td>4,169</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6041 2004 Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Fund</td>
<td>37,561</td>
<td>8,776</td>
<td>15,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6049 2006 California Community College Capital Outlay Bond Fund</td>
<td>340,853</td>
<td>232,143</td>
<td>34,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS, EXPENDITURES, ALL FUNDS</strong></td>
<td>$382,383</td>
<td>$254,091</td>
<td>$329,407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DETAIL OF APPROPRIATIONS AND ADJUSTMENTS**

3 CAPITAL OUTLAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0658 1996 Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Fund</th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPROPRIATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 Budget Act appropriation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$11,873</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS, EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$11,873</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0705 Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Fund of 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>APPROPRIATIONS</strong></th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior year balances available:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6870-301-0705, Budget Act of 2008</td>
<td>$1,106</td>
<td>$1,106</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals Available</strong></td>
<td>$1,106</td>
<td>$1,106</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance available in subsequent years</td>
<td>-1,106</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS, EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$1,106</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0785 1988 Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Fund

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range.*
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#### 3 CAPITAL OUTLAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATIONS</th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior year balances available:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6870-301-6041, Budget Act of 2008 as reappropriated by Item 6870-490, Budget Act of 2009</td>
<td>$4,362</td>
<td>$193</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals Available</td>
<td>$4,362</td>
<td>$193</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance available in subsequent years</td>
<td>-193</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS, EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$4,169</td>
<td>$193</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6041 2004 Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATIONS</th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>301 Budget Act appropriation as amended by Chapter 1, Statutes of 2009, Fourth Extraordinary Session</td>
<td>$7,031</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior year balances available:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6870-301-6041, BA of 2004 as reapp by Item 6870-460/05, Item 6870-491/06, reverted by Item 6870-497/06, &amp; reapp by Item 6870-490, BA of 2007, 2008, &amp; 2009</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6870-301-6041, BA of 2005, as reapp by Item 6870-491, BA of 2006 as partial rvt by Item 6870-487, BA of 07 &amp; reapp by Item 6870-490 BA 97, 08, &amp; 09</td>
<td>8,966</td>
<td>$8,583</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augmentation per Government Code Sections 16352, 16409 and 16354</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6870-301-6041, Budget Act of 2007</td>
<td>29,888</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversion per Government Code Sections 16351, 16351.5 and 16408</td>
<td>-7,421</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6870-301-6041, Budget Act of 2008, as reappropriated by Item 6870-490, Budget Act of 2009</td>
<td>10,956</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversion per Government Code Sections 16351, 16351.5 and 16408</td>
<td>-944</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6870-301-6041, Budget Act of 2009, as partially reverted by Item 6870-497 and as reappropriated by Item 6870-490, Budget Act of 2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6870-303-6041, Budget Act of 2007 as reappropriated by Item 6870-490, Budget Act of 2009</td>
<td>10,068</td>
<td>10,068</td>
<td>10,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversion per Government Code Sections 16351, 16351.5 and 16408</td>
<td>-533</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals Available</strong></td>
<td>$67,036</td>
<td>$24,181</td>
<td>$15,405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6049 2006 California Community College Capital Outlay Bond Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATIONS</th>
<th>2009-10*</th>
<th>2010-11*</th>
<th>2011-12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>301 Budget Act appropriation as amended by Chapter 1, Statutes of 2009, Fourth Extraordinary Session</td>
<td>$204,082</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversion per Government Code Sections 16351, 16351.5 and 16408</td>
<td>-11,318</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 Budget Act appropriation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$92,563</td>
<td>$48,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303 Budget Act appropriation</td>
<td>5,191</td>
<td>6,590</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior year balances available:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6870-301-6049, Budget Act of 2008 as reappropriated by Item 6870-490, Budget Act of 2007 and partially reverted by Item 6970-497, BA 2008</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6870-301-6049, Budget Act of 2007, as partially reverted by Item 6870-497, and reappropriated by Item 6870-490, Budget Acts of 2008, 2009 and 2010</td>
<td>169,872</td>
<td>56,156</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversion per Government Code Sections 16351, 16351.5 and 16408</td>
<td>-4,788</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6870-301-6049, Budget Act of 2007, as partially reverted by Item 6870-497, and reappropriated by Item 6870-490, Budget Acts of 2008, 2009, and 2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37,508</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range.
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Reversion per Government Code Sections 16351, 16351.5 and 16408

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 6870-301-6049, Budget Act of 2009, as partially reverted by Item 6870-497, and as reappropriated by Item 6870-490, Budget Act of 2010</td>
<td>-39,779</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6870-301-6049, Budget Act of 2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>107,000</td>
<td>5,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversion per Government Code Sections 16351, 16351.5 and 16408</td>
<td>-6,242</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversion per Government Code Sections 16351, 16351.5 and 16408</td>
<td>-7,719</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6870-303-6049, Budget Act of 2008, as reappropriated by Item 6870-490, Budget Act of 2009</td>
<td>9,759</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversion per Government Code Sections 16351, 16351.5 and 16408</td>
<td>-991</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals Available</td>
<td>$788,000</td>
<td>$497,607</td>
<td>$314,082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unexpended balance, estimated savings

-46,883 | - | -

Balance available in subsequent years

-398,464 | -285,464 | -

**TOTALS, EXPENDITURES**

$340,653 | $232,143 | $314,082

**TOTALS, EXPENDITURES, ALL FUNDS (Capital Outlay)**

$382,533 | $254,091 | $329,487