



**APPROXIMATE TRANSCRIPT  
OF THE  
PARKING FEE INCREASES  
TOWN HALL**

**Tuesday, November 15, 2011**

**City College of San Francisco  
50 Phelan Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94112  
E-101 "CONLAN AUDITORIUM"**

**START: Approximately 2:00PM**

**PRESENT:** CCSF Vice Chancellor of Finance Peter Goldstein, Bursar Rebeca Chavez, Chief of Police Andre Barnes, Associate Dean of Student Activities Samuel Santos, members of the Ocean Campus Associated Student Council and Staff, faculty and students.

**ASC President Arenas:** I'd just like to thank those that came. Most of you know I'm Bobby Arenas, President, and we have some of the people from the Council here: our VP of ICC Andi Pulido; Carlos [Martinez], a Senator; our Vending Coordinator [Ian Robinson]; Cuong Tang, our VP of Finance; and Julie [Du], our VP of Admin. We're going to hold a little Town Hall Meeting about potentially raising the parking fees from three to five dollars a day and then from forty to fifty a semester. Peter Goldstein, our Vice Chancellor of Finance will be giving a little presentation and then open up to Q&A.

**Vice Chancellor of Finance Peter Goldstein:** Thank you. If some of you were here yesterday, you're going to hear some of the same things, but I think it's important. Also, since there are so many seats, I'm not going to shout loud enough for you to hear me way in the back, if that's where you want to sit. So I invite you all to move up. You all know very well what the last few years have been like in the state of California, and how there just seems to be an unending lack of money, or taking away of money, from education. And City College has been part of ground zero of that. We've lost over 20 million dollars from the state in direct support over the last three years. It started by them taking up to 50% of the money away from some of our student services programs, and then it was topped by them taking up to 13 million dollars away from money that supports classes at City College this year.

I wish I could say I know that next year will be better for the college, but there's already a memo being leaked by the State Assembly saying the Governor was wrong, and the state's short 5 to 8 billion dollars in the year that starts this coming July first. And with the Democrats and Republicans, despite of the fact that there are actually a few Republicans in the State Legislature, unable to get the right number for a vote to increase revenue, our revenue keeps disappearing. We are thinking of going to voters in San Francisco to ask them to help us directly. That wouldn't be until November 2012, and that would be not easy, but many of us are confident that we have an excellent chance of pulling that together and winning. We would be asking Property Tax owners in San Francisco to pay a new Parcel Tax, and that money would be dedicated solely to supporting City College. But as I said, that's an election that wouldn't even happen until November of 2012.

So in the meantime, we continue to live under diminished resources, and the strategy the college has adopted has been different than a lot of other Community Colleges in the state. When we lost all our student services money, or what the state calls Categorical Programs, the college collectively said, "A lot of these programs are pretty important. If the state takes away half the money, we can't cut the program

in half; that would be too devastating. We're going to do other stuff to try to get through that and have a small cut to those programs." And so, over the last 3 years, things happened, starting with the Administrators having their salaries reduced up to 6%, Unrepresented Classified employees having their salaries reduced up to 6%; then the faculty, the following year, had their salaries reduced by 1%. Classified workers, all the clerical staff and IT staff and custodians, public safety officers had their salaries reduced around 2.5%. And folks had their career step increments frozen. So there was a lot of collective sacrifice in the spirit of trying to avoid lay-offs, trying to keep programs as full as we could.

But basically, we were swimming upstream, and in this latest round of swimming upstream, with the state cutting up to 13 million dollars, for sure 9.5, but I say up to, because we won't get the final number until, I think, December 15, when the State Department of Finance announces just how short the state is in terms of revenue for the current year—and it's already short; they made an announcement earlier this week, but their final number will be December 15.

Community Colleges in California live under something called the Fifty Percent Law. You may have heard of that, maybe not. What it says is that, if you're a Community College, you must spend fifty percent of your operating budget on what's called the Direct Expense of Education. What that means, by and large, is salaries and benefits for instructors. There are a couple of other things in there, but not librarians, not counselors—instructors. City College, as all the other colleges in the state, is typically between 49 and 52 percent of every dollar we spend is spent on the Direct Expense of Education. When the state cuts money for classes, and that's the money they cut, up to 13 million dollars, the cold, hard numbers say, "OK, the state cuts 13 million, we spend 50 cents of every dollar on education. We're going to have to take 6.5 million dollars out of money for offering classes." Nobody at City College proposed doing that this past year. The Administration working with the College Budget Committee didn't propose cutting 6.5 million dollars from classes. We proposed cutting 3.8 million dollars from classes in an effort to try to cut other things and not cut classes so much. I should say we did give everyone back their money this year. All of those wage cuts that I just went through before, all those people got their money back to where it was before. Still, none of them have got an across-the-board wage increase at City College since July 2007, so it's almost 5 years before the next one will try to be negotiated. That's under talks right now, but certainly the College doesn't have any money right now.

3.8 million dollars was rejected by the Board of Trustees. When they adopted the final budget, they said, "We don't even want you to cut classes 3.8 million dollars. We want you to cut classes by 1.9 million dollars." So the state is taking away up to 13.5 million dollars, directly out of money for classes—it's called apportioning—and the College's plan is to cut 1.9 million dollars out of that money, a very disproportionate response in favor of trying to save classes. Frankly, it might be the most disproportionate one in the entire state. So we're going through this year trying to do that.

We also said we would cut money out of what we call non-instructional assignments for faculty, and that we would try to live with a smaller workforce through attrition, without laying anybody off. Primarily, as classified workers leave because they retire, they resign, or they find a different job, we wouldn't hire anybody to take their place. We've been doing that, not exclusively, but for the most part, for a couple years now. And now it's complete; now there's a total hiring freeze at the College, except for faculty, and nobody is hired when somebody leaves, and it's been that way for a little while now. But in spite of all this, when you look at the numbers, what you find is that the College is not balancing its budget right now. And so we're looking every place else, because it's a bit of a desperate time, to find other money. We're looking at leftover balances in about 18 different places related to grants, money that we got from the state that was really better used for instructional equipment but could be used for other things, money related to payback we get from the Federal Government when we spend some time trying to educate students whether they're eligible for MediCal, etc. There's a long list, and those are the biggest ones, the ones I just mentioned.

And then there has been another look at the College's parking fund. The College collects money only from students. Faculty, administrators, classified staff do not pay for parking at City College. By and large, those people that I just named are represented by unions. To charge them for parking would clearly be what's called a Change in Working Conditions and would have to be negotiated at the bargaining table,

and the unions would have to agree to make that kind of a change. The College is now in active negotiations with both of the major unions here, and it's called bad faith bargaining if I reveal any of that to you, so I can't talk about anything specific. But I'm not promising you or not promising you that that topic will come up; I literally cannot say anything about that.

But that's been the history. I've been here for 20 years. The employees of the College have never paid for parking. Yesterday when somebody said, "Well, why is it fair if the students pay for parking, then the faculty don't pay for parking?" I said, "If the faculty union was here, I think what they'd say to you is, 'They've been sacrificing over the last two years. They gave up their step increases one year, which they had no commitment of ever getting back; they gave up 1% of their salary, which they had no commitment of ever getting back the year that it was lost; they, in terms of part-time ranks, are losing assignments and will continue losing assignments—the most junior part-time faculty will lose the ability to teach here at all—they'll be out next semester.'" So I think they would say, "We've been doing a lot, and it doesn't show up in what we pay for parking, but it shows up in these other ways, and they add up to millions of dollars." The other groups would point in their own way to other things that they've done.

The Parking Fund, which is the place that parking fees go, both the semester pass fees and the daily parking fees, can only be used for parking and transportation related expenses. The parking and transportation related expenses include cleaning the lots, the police officers who write the tickets in the lots (part of the time, not all of the time), lighting for the lots, maintenance that goes on there. Any expense related to having parking and what it takes to monitor parking is a legitimate expense.

So I want to be very upfront: there's more than one reason why the College is looking at raising parking fees. One of them is money, that by collecting more money we can offset more expenses and try to keep ourselves floating here as we continue to lose money from the state. The other reasons are because the Board has adopted a Facilities Master Plan for the College, as required by CEQA, the California Environmental Quality Act (it's often what people think of as an EIR report). It said we're going to build new buildings here, and as part of the impact we have on San Francisco and this neighborhood, we are going to actively discourage people from driving. And we're going to do that by giving them a financial incentive to take mass transit instead of drive. With a \$40.00 parking pass per semester, the cost of parking here per day is about 60-something cents. By the way, that price is set by the State Legislature and Government, and it's 50% of that for Financial Aid students, so the \$40.00 is really \$20.00 for students on Financial Aid. Going from \$40.00 to \$50.00, that becomes something like 74 cents a day; you can do the math, if you're here 4 times a week for the whole semester. It's a relatively small increase, and on a daily basis considerably less than what somebody would pay for riding MUNI, which I believe costs \$70.00 for a monthly pass.

**Student A:** \$72.00.

**Goldstein:** \$72.00 or \$2.00 each way without a pass. The \$40.00 has been in place for several years now; I believe more than 5 years. The daily rate was last changed 4 years ago, and was set at \$3.00. The proposal would be to increase it to as much as \$5.00, which clearly would be more than taking the MUNI round trip, would be more than buying a monthly pass, and would be consistent with what the Board said in terms of its environmental impact on this neighborhood and San Francisco. So there are multiple arguments here. One is about money. One is about what we've committed to do environmentally. And the other one is about fairness. I don't dismiss the fairness one; I've spent a lot of time talking about it the last couple of days, the fact that students are the only group of people that pay for parking at City College.

**Student A:** How close is the parking program to being self-sufficient, or is it at all?

**Goldstein:** It's not self-sufficient when you think about the total collections are about \$650,000 this year right now from semester passes and daily parking, and it depends on what percentage of public aid safety officers' time and custodians' time is assigned to the activities related to the lots.

**Student A:** You said that money goes directly toward paying for officers and the entire program, so how do you figure out how much of that money goes toward the police budget?

**Goldstein:** Right now, relatively little, but I rely on the Chief, who I should have introduced; he's with us: Andre Barnes is our Chief of Public Safety, to give me a reasonable estimate of what percentage of time of this workforce is spent on parking and traffic related activities.

**Student A:** So other than the police force, is the rest of the program self-sufficient or anywhere close to it?

**Goldstein:** In the past, that hasn't really been the goal. The goal has been to follow whatever the state says for the semester pass and try to get the \$1.00 (which became \$2.00, which became \$3.00) a day more in line with what it takes for other people to get to campus. To the extent that the money that goes into the fund, and it all does, there are other expenses that go into machines and whatever else had to be acquired; we've used whatever's left over to pay for those other expenses. So we have never actually, by design, tried to say, "What are all those expenses and what's getting charged to that fund?" So a lot of those expenses sit under the Unrestricted General Fund.

**Student A:** So it's like it is paid for and then there's reserve that's used to pay for other parking expenses—it's used eventually, but every year there is an extra amount?

**Goldstein:** There actually is, and yes. If you look historically, not all the money's spent every year. That's correct.

**Student A:** So if you're asking for more, and this has to stay within this system, what is it going to be used for?

**Goldstein:** It can only be used for the things I described before, but we would be--

**Student B:** Sorry, I can't really hear--

**Goldstein:** Then it would be great if you could move up here--

**Student B:** What is the amount that's in that account as of right now?

**Goldstein:** Right. Well, before you got here I said I wasn't going to shout because there's a lot of seats.

**Student B:** I'm so sorry, totally my disrespect.

**Goldstein:** What was the question?

**Student B:** What is the balance? Because you just said that there's an amount left over every year.

**Goldstein:** Right. (Is Rebeca here?)

**Student B:** And so keeping that in mind, what with the expenses that you have with the lights and cleaning the lots and the police officers, what is the money in that account, as of right now?

**Goldstein:** Hang on, and I'll give you a number, precisely. I don't want to give you the wrong number. Rebeca [Chavez] is in this building.

**Student B:** Should I go find her? What room is she in?

**Goldstein:** She's right down the hall.

**Student B:** OK.

**Goldstein:** I'm sure it's several hundred thousand dollars.

**Student B:** Several hundred thousand?

**Goldstein:** Yes.

**Student B:** OK.

**Dean Samuel Santos:** I'll go get her.

**Student A:** So is there a project that you're putting a lot of this money toward? Because if there's already an extra amount, what is this new amount going to be for?

**Goldstein:** I think the answer to your question is since there's already a balance, even if you want to charge more fees, more expenses that you could charge for that balance, why do you need to generate any more money? And the answer to that is, number one, we were trying to make it sustainable. In other words, to the extent that we can charge additional legitimate expenses to the fund, we would want to be able to repeat that next year and the year after and the year after, because our financial problems are not ending and we would just have a new expense coming back on us every year. And then also don't forget the other part that I mentioned, which is the non-financial argument, which is to create this disincentive for people to drive to campus.

**Student A:** Well, it sounds like you have extra money in that sense that you can put towards actually incentivizing public transportation by making it more affordable.

**Goldstein:** Yes. And there are a couple of ideas that were brought up recently that I had said, "Sounds good. Somebody just needs to show me how many people we're talking about." Whether it was bus passes for the homeless student program, or wherever we're turning people away where they could get that kind of assistance. We have gone to MUNI on more than one occasion in the past, and said to them, "You should sell a discounted monthly pass for City College students who right now have an ID card, so you can rest assured that they really are a student," and they said no.

**Student A:** That's an eighth of the population of San Francisco that would be eligible for that discount, which is understandable why they wouldn't want to do that.

**Goldstein:** But it does seem like, in some ways, arbitrary that if you are a high school student you can get a discounted pass, but not if you're a City College student. The best response they ever gave us was, "Well, if you charge every student at City College a fee, then we'll do the discounted pass," but a lot of students won't actually get the pass. They'll just keep paying fees. Other comments or questions?

**Faculty A:** Why are the daily rates being changed a higher percentage than the monthly rates?

**Goldstein:** Well, we don't control the monthly rates, for starters. That's set by the Legislature and Government. By the way, as far as I know, and I asked Rebeca this question last week, we did not turn away anybody for a semester pass this semester, so the opportunity was actually there for anybody to park for 60-something cents a day.

**Faculty A:** Can I say something to clarify that? In the past, we have turned people away.

**Goldstein:** Right. I asked about this semester.

**Faculty A:** I understand. What I'm saying is in the past we have turned people away, so how is the number set for how many permits you'll let students buy?

**Goldstein:** I don't know. When Rebeca comes in, she can help us understand.

**Faculty A:** Hah.

**Goldstein:** Is there something funny about that?

**Faculty A:** I guess. It's like, it just seems disingenuous to me, to be honest with you. Because ever since I've been here, we've turned students away. So for us to not know how that number is set, I find that hard to believe.

**Goldstein:** Well, years ago, Steven Herman's office supervised that program, and he may have set some kind of a cap with Rebeca. Since he's been gone now for over two years, I have not done that. And when I asked her that question, her response for this semester was that we had not turned anybody away.

**Faculty A:** So going forward though, if we raise this fee that dramatically there will obviously be a much greater demand for those permits, so it seems like a really useful piece of information I would assume that you would be able to provide.

**Goldstein:** Rebeca, the question was, in the past we have set a cap on the number of semester passes we would sell?

**CCSF Bursar Rebeca Chavez:** Mm-hmm.

**Goldstein:** And I said specifically, when Steven was here, that he worked with your office with respect to semester passes perhaps?

**Chavez:** Right.

**Goldstein:** But when I asked you recently had we turned anybody away from buying a semester pass this semester, your answer to me was that you didn't think you had turned anybody away.

**Chavez:** We usually don't run out of passes.

**Faculty A:** How many are there, and what's the cap on what you sell?

**Chavez:** Well, what I usually order is about 40,000 permits per semester, and that depends on figures from the previous semester that sold, so I haven't given a cap to how many to sell.

**Faculty A:** So going forward, if you said you wanted to buy a permit, because the fee's going to go up, there would be no limit other than the number that you reported, is that right? So is that going to be the Administration's policy, that we'll sell as many as people want to buy?

**Goldstein:** That was our policy this year.

**Faculty A:** That's not what I asked.

**Goldstein:** We have no intent on changing the policy. That's what we did right now; we're doing the same thing next semester.

**Faculty A:** In which case, the revenue could very well go down.

**Goldstein:** It might. There are also going to be fewer parking spaces here next year. When we open up the site to build the Performing Arts Center, which is going to happen no later than April, a big chunk of parking spaces are going to disappear forever from across the street.

**Student B:** So I was wondering, Rebeca (hi, now that you're in the room), my question earlier was that he says that this department, every year there's an overflow or an extra amount in said bank account, and he went and had you called so that you could figure out exactly how much money is in that account as of right now. He said it was several hundred thousand dollars?

**Goldstein:** It's probably a better answer to give as of June 30, because right now you don't have all the expenses in, but you've got all the revenue.

**Chavez:** Right.

**Student B:** OK, as of June 30.

**Chavez:** The fund balance, let's do that, was about \$800,000 for last year, but for this year's budget, we're up to about \$800,000 on the budget, so it doesn't leave very much. And the reason why it's so high is because we are looking at getting new dispenser machines, which can cost \$200,000 or \$300,000.

**Student B:** Parking lots are disappearing, so how many new dispenser machines do you need?

**Chavez:** Right now, we have nine, which doesn't seem to be sufficient, and the ones that are out there right now are, from what I understand from the students, very slow. And those are not our machines; we rent them. So now we're looking at possibly bringing in new dispenser machines, and there's a possibility that if the District decides to purchase them, then that money's going to that.

**Goldstein:** As I recalled --

**Student B:** I'm sorry, I'm not finished yet. So what are your expenses each year? What were your expenses last year, since this year's not over yet? What were your expenses last year?

**Chavez:** I don't control all the expenses. That's something that runs through my office. Let me see if I've got the figures.

**Student B:** Because if you're bringing in \$800,000, are you spending \$800,000?

**Chavez:** That was a balance that had accumulated over years--

**Student B:** That's nearly a million dollars.

**Chavez:** ...from one year to another. Last year, I think we were pretty much even: \$500,000 in expenses, and maybe \$500,000 in revenue, so we were really pretty close. But that \$800,000 is an accumulation from the beginning that we started parking. So that's why it's so much.

**Student A:** So those are just serving so we can purchase equipment to upgrade the quality of the parking system. I had another question for you. What is the projected income from the increase of fees for City next year? You said that there would be less parking spots.

**Goldstein:** Yeah, it's a little hard to project, because I don't know how many spaces are going to disappear.

**Student A:** Right.

**Goldstein:** Until the construction firm gets out here and actually marks off what they need, which will be bigger than the building itself, we actually don't know how many spaces will be gone. By the way, I'll come back to that, one thought I had, we used to cap the spaces, because we started getting complaints from the students at one point that, if you buy the pass it was interpreted as there's going to be a spot for you when you come here. And people were getting frustrated that they bought the pass, and they'd show up, and there were no spots. That was before we took the berm out—and probably most of you were not here then—of the middle of the reservoir, which opened up a lot more parking, and so that problem seemed to disappear after that time. Maybe that's why we stopped limiting the number of passes. Now, where did I leave off?

**Student A:** Projected revenue for the--

**Goldstein:** Right. The numbers, Rebeca, that you gave me said that on an annual basis the semester permits generate about \$275,000, and the dispensers generate between 380 and 390 per year. So that's the daily parking, and what's going to happen to daily parking? I don't know. If the price goes up, if that has an effect, if the number of spaces disappear, obviously that has an effect. So it's a little unknowable.

**Student A:** At least another \$150,000 probably with the percentage increase as well as including the potential lost spaces?

**Goldstein:** That's a guesstimate.

**Student A:** That's a low guess.

**Goldstein:** Until I see something that shows how much is going to disappear, which I've asked for but haven't gotten, I don't know. I don't want to leave you unsatisfied on the answer you got, so did you get the information you were looking for?

**Student B:** All this information—I'm not entirely sure how you're processing it, and here maybe you can enlighten me. If you're breaking even, and what you just stated 5 minutes ago, you are only able to use the revenue for parking and fees for parking, whatever the name of your department is, then first of all, my first question to you would be why do you need to raise fees if you're breaking even? And secondly, you said earlier that there were multiple reasons for raising fees. One of them would be for revenue, which you're not able to use in any other department but for parking. And the second one you said would be to discourage this influx of cars into the college because of our impact on the environment. To me, that seems extremely counter-productive. If you're raising fees to discourage people from driving in, you're automatically cutting revenue, and so I don't understand how you can reconcile those two reasons.

**Goldstein:** They are at odds.

**Student B:** They're entirely different arguments.

**Goldstein:** The Board has adopted as its principle that we will discourage driving to City College. Period.

**Student B:** So then your reason is not to raise revenue; your reason is to discourage students from coming in with their vehicles. You can't state both. You have to pick one or the other.

**Goldstein:** One of the methods to discourage driving is to raise the price of bringing in your car.

**Student B:** So then your reason is not for revenue; it's to discourage students from bringing their car.

**Goldstein:** I'm being very upfront in saying what happens to that money and what plans the college has for additional money that came in.

**Student B:** Right, but we're talking about reasons behind it.

**Student A:** It can be both reasons.

**Student B:** But they're counter-productive.

**Student A:** It depends on the reaction of the students. If the students decide to stop driving and then do public transportation, that fulfills that reason. If they continue to drive, then that fulfills the revenue reason. So it's both, and it depends on the reaction of the students.

**Student B:** I understand that, but they both seem counter-productive. If we're saying that the goal of City College is not revenue...

**Goldstein:** They could balance each other out.

**Student B:** ...it seems counter-productive, and it seems disingenuous. That's my point.

**Goldstein:** Why do you say it's disingenuous?

**Student B:** Because it is.

**Goldstein:** Which part?

**Student B:** The entire thing. It's counter-productive.

**Goldstein:** Which part is disingenuous?

**Student B:** The entire thing.

**Goldstein:** How?

**Student B:** Because I can agree to you that, as a student, this could fulfill one or both reasons, but we're talking about you, as an Administrator, choosing the reason why, and you're choosing to be upfront with the fees and the money, which I completely, just... thank you for that. But we're talking about the reasons why you're raising fees right now. And so you can't tell me what I'm thinking; I want to know what you're thinking, and your exact reason for doing this, because they both counter-produce each other.

**Goldstein:** My thinking is that some of both will happen.

**Student B:** OK.

**Goldstein:** So some students will be willing to pay more, and some students will say, "I'm not driving anymore, OK? I'll buy the monthly MUNI pass." Or some students will say, "I'll buy the semester pass. I should have done that last year." And so, at the end of the day, we might actually have the same amount of money or a little less; we may be in roughly the same place. If the driving behavior of students is very inelastic, and I don't know that it is, but it is for many other parts of the population, then we will end up with more money. There are people who will just decide, "I hate it, but that's the way I have to get here every day, and that's what I will pay." And if that's the case, then we will end up with more money. But either way, we are committed to discouraging people from driving here. If we end up with less money, it won't help the college's budget, that's for sure. We'll spend down the balance on the machines that Rebeca just spoke about and on the expenses we can charge off legitimately, but it may ultimately end up, after the current year, providing little to no relief to the college's budget problem. That absolutely could be the case.

**Student B:** Here's my confusion: you are only able to use this money for parking and fees, right?

**Goldstein:** Parking and traffic related expenses.

**Student B:** Parking and traffic related expenses. I'm sorry. So if you're only able to use this for parking and traffic related expenses, how would that relieve the problem in the first place? Would that mean an extra class? Would that mean another professor gets hired? What does that mean to me as a student?

**Goldstein:** The college is looking at negative numbers right now, not extra money that would allow us to do anything more. So we're trying to figure out ways to get rid of the negative numbers—

**Student B:** You're saying --

**Goldstein:** Let me finish. The college has a police force that spends about 15% of its time?

**Chief Andre Barnes:** If I may, what I think is imperative, a couple things with those -- Good afternoon everyone, I'm Chief of Police here on Campus. One of the things, and I've had previous employments where the police department at CSU where we ran the parking operation, and it brought in a couple million dollars, actually 10 million dollars. I know \$800,000 seems like a lot of money—it certainly is, in my opinion; I don't have that. But in terms of the actual revenue, it's really a small amount of dollars that can be spent quickly. One of the things that I am proposing is in most cases (and I think it may get some alleviation from the General Fund) right now, my operation, my officers, including myself and then supervisors, spend anywhere from about 10-20%—probably in some cases higher—dealing with parking related issues, whether it's trouble in the parking lot, whether its fixing the lighting, getting things paved. And one of the things that I think we are, we are heavily dependent on the General Fund, my operation, and I think it's prudent that we use other department funds, because we do a lot of work in the parking, to spend that on my staff, proportionate of those dollars, which would then mean we're not using General Fund dollars to run the police department, particularly when a lot of that is dealt with parking related issues. So I think we could heavily eat into that \$800,000. In addition to just the services of my police officers, our equipment issues this past year, and I've been trying to get the college to pay more into the vehicles that we drive. Again, we do a high amount of driving in our parking lots for various reasons, and right now all of those dollars are coming from the General Fund, and I personally think that's inappropriate. I mean, we can best use those dollars that you speak of, the \$800,000, and a little more. Right now, the parking pays for one police officer, which is about \$60-70,000 a year, which is low compared to what you would find at any other campus in terms of police related activity. I think that could easily be somewhere in the half-million dollars a year if we were paying proportionately. So I think it would be my hope that any funds that are used for parking, we could replace those and get rid of the General Fund dollars that we use, which may be used for whatever. It could be classes, it could be teachers, or whatever. So that's what I'm trying to force the college to do, is to get away from the widely unrestricted funds for my operation and put as much as we can into the parking related fund. I think this gentleman had a question for me.

**Student C:** Chief, I was wondering, does your fleet run on natural gas or on gasoline? Because I know that most of the SFPD and the CHP cars run on the same thing my car runs on which is CNG. What I'm trying to say is that, if you're paying \$4.09 for regular gasoline, as opposed to \$2.00 a gallon for CNG [Compressed Natural Gas], wouldn't that offset whatever you're spending on just the operation alone? And the fact that a lot of people are driving alternatively fueled vehicles like Priuses, if you were to put a station here, and I know that PG&E and the state actually do give you rebates, you can actually install a dispenser here, and could also turn a profit for those who use hybrids or CNG cars to be able to be funds that would go back to the school. I know the state car dispensary give you like, \$100,000 to bring in a dispenser, and PG&E also gives you a chunk, so that would actually help the revenue for the school.

**Barnes:** Right. Well, a couple things to that. Currently, what we're driving right now use regular gasoline. We purchase our vehicles through the City and County, so whatever contract they're under, that's how we get our vehicles. Right now, our fleet is relatively old,—so none of them use alternative fuel sources, but ideally in the future when we do purchase new vehicles or lease them we could follow along with the CHP and City and County in order to get those natural resources.

**Student C:** I have a [indecipherable] in my 2002 [indecipherable], which is pretty similar to what you guys have now, and it's already CNG, so overhead cost would go down.

**[Indecipherable exchange between Student C and Barnes]**

**Barnes:** Right, and also we get our fuel source from the City and County. We don't use outside gas stations, so we actually pay a much lower cost than we would if we were to drive into a Shell station, and so forth. So absolutely, we constantly look at that on a daily basis, and when appropriate we also walk instead of using our vehicles, etc. When we patrol a campus like Ocean, we often have to drive. But those are things that we look to when we make our purchases.

**Arenas:** I just want to say the Vice Chancellor only has about 10 more minutes, so we need to keep all the topics relevant to make the best use of time.

**Barnes:** And I would also push that when we were talking about this \$800,000 left over, again, I would argue that that's a relatively small amount. You know, I am sensitive to students and the dollars that they spend, and certainly I think we need to be very careful about how we act with those dollars and how we spend them. I think, unfortunately, sometimes, you do pay a little bit for future generations, and I think also what's needed for our particular campus. Particularly here, is that we have looked at it and we haven't done the switch yet because of the cost. What we really need is to look at possibly building a garage-type facility—which means \$800,000 would go fast. In fact, we would still have to go out for a bond to even come close to doing that. So when we talk about having a reserve, anytime you're talking about under a million dollars, those aren't a lot of dollars and can be spent very quickly.

**Goldstein:** Before you go.

**Barnes:** Yes?

**Goldstein:** Since the two folks in back said I was disingenuous twice, maybe I wasn't clear in trying to explain this, so I'm going to make another attempt at it. What we're trying to do in a multiple number of strategies right now in the middle of the year is to find other sources of money that we can move expenses to that are currently sitting in the college's General Fund, because when you look at the college's General Fund from here to June 30, we look like we're in trouble, like we're not going to make it—even though we're already taking money out of our savings account to try to make it work. So we're searching for all these other places where we can legitimately move any of these expenses, adding this fund to another source of money to help us get through this year with the strategy put forth. And that strategy was primarily to cut way less classes than the state basically told us to. Now, will that be sustainable in the future or not? I don't know. It depends upon the behavior of the parking piece of it. Will it be sustainable if students stop driving and start taking the train more? Then no. We'll spend down the balance and we'll find ourselves within a short period of time saying, "Whoa—these expenses now have to move back into the General Fund." That's a little unknowable right now. I hope that helps you frame it better in terms of what is the college talking about doing and why is it suggesting it at this point.

**Student A:** Yeah, it makes perfect sense that you're diverting police funds from the General Fund to coming from the traffic fund. But currently, what percentage is paid by the parking and traffic?

**Barnes:** Right now, I don't know what the percentage is, it's very minute, but again we only charge for one full police officer staffed here, which is about \$60,000.

**Goldstein:** So that's probably like 3%.

**Student A:** So you're looking at like 15-20%?

**Goldstein:** I don't think we'd be able to do that, but we'd be doing more than the 3%.

**Student A:** OK.

**Goldstein:** Other questions, comments? One announcement before I get to this student. This is not on the Board agenda for November. I know initially that's what I had talked about. So rather than rush it, because registration's going to start soon and normally we'd be selling semester passes, we're going to delay selling the semester passes, let registration go forward as it normally would, and then we would ask the Board to consider a change in December. And then after the Board made whatever decision it would make—which would, of course, be in a public meeting—then we would sell the semester passes after that.

**Faculty A:** So I think the thing that's ironic in this is that the college last year and in the last several years spent thousands of dollars sending students to Sacramento to stop fee increases...

**Goldstein:** Right.

**Faculty A:** ...on the grounds and the rationale that those fee increases will displace students, that we will lose students. And those arguments have been made locally and statewide, a very strong push for us not to do that. And then for us to turn around and locally implement a fee that is regressive... the statewide fee can at least be deferred by a fee waiver, by low-income students. A daily parking fee is a regressive fee. That means it applies across the board and affects low-income students disproportionately. So the great irony to me is that we would fight a fee at the state level and then implement one at the local level that could impact students more with a greater dollar amount that is also not waivable for low-income students. I mean, to me, that defies all logic. I don't know why we would do it, and in this conversation of whether they're going to drive or take a bus, well, funny, because statewide what do we say when we raise fees? It's that we lose students. But that's not in this conversation. Your assumption is that if students don't drive, they'll take the bus. Well, a lot of students, when you increase their fees, don't come. And we make that argument consistently at the state level as an institution. So why do we think that a greater amount of fee increase, which is what this will come out to for someone who comes every day, won't have a similar amount of displacement? I don't get it, and why isn't that part of the dialogue?

**Goldstein:** Well, I've got a couple of responses for that. Absolutely, we oppose fee increases for enrollment, for students historically every year whenever they're suggested. As an institution we do that. Right now, a change from \$40 to \$50 a semester on a pass, which is available, is the equivalent of about, I think it's about 12 cents a day.

**Faculty A:** I'm talking about the daily fee.

**Goldstein:** I understand. But I'm saying people don't have to pay the daily fee. They can buy the semester pass.

**Faculty A:** So why implement the daily fee if... this is the thing that [Student B] was saying. It doesn't make sense. If you're saying that it will raise half a million dollars, which is the figure I saw at the budget meeting, and it's clearly coming from students...

**Goldstein:** OK. The figure you saw in the budget meeting is based on the balance that's currently sitting in the parking fund.

**Faculty A:** So how much is it projected to raise?

**Goldstein:** It's not knowable right now until we know what happens to this parking lot. But I would say it's probably more on the scale of \$200,000 a year than \$500,000.

**Faculty A:** In which case we're balancing the budget on the backs of students, something that we oppose, and on a regressive fee. That's a really important issue to me. At least the statewide fees, as much as we oppose them, are not regressive. At least students on financial aid can defer them, in which case the increases don't impact them. But this is a regressive fee.

**Goldstein:** I don't know that everyone would agree with that. There are people who would suggest that car ownership is an indicator of something to do with your economic status.

**Faculty A:** Well, in this institution it's not true.

**Goldstein:** Really?

**Faculty A:** You need to go out into the parking lot and look around.

**Goldstein:** I think you're just making an assertion. That's your opinion, and I'm saying that people have a different opinion.

**Faculty A:** It's a fact; go out into the parking lot.

**Goldstein:** It's not a fact that car ownership has nothing to do with how much money you have. That's not a fact.

**Faculty A:** It has little to do with students' economic status at this institution. Working students, students who are parents, students that need vehicles to get to work every single day in order to stay in college and help support their families. I mean really? You're trying to tell me that that's a rich student who can afford to pay money to...

**Goldstein:** I didn't say they were rich. You said it was regressive, and I'm saying students who don't own a car tend to have less money than students who do.

**Faculty A:** It's regressive, and you know this. It's just like a flat tax. It's the same fee regardless of your income, and we all know that's a regressive fee. So the college should not take contradictory positions.

**Chavez:** I just want to add that it's not the same for all students; Financial Aid students get a 50% discount on that parking permit.

**Student B:** Not everyone is on Financial Aid: what if I don't qualify as a Financial Aid student?

**Goldstein:** And if you don't, you can qualify for 75 cents a day for parking your car with a \$50 permit.

**Faculty A:** In which case you'll have more of a budget problem, because the revenue will drop for that. So if I go out and spend every day in that parking lot and hustle people who will buy those permits, your numbers will be worse.

**Goldstein:** Well, if that's what you choose to do, then perhaps that would be the result. But what I'm saying is that the number that you saw is related to spending what's already there.

**Faculty A:** I understand that.

**Goldstein:** It's not a projection of income to get now from changing the fee. Changing the fee builds in the possibility of some of this being sustainable beyond this year. That's all it is.

**Faculty A:** And it's against the argument you make consistently at the state level.

**Goldstein:** That's the argument you're making based on your assumption that the students paying a daily fee will not try to access a semester fee.

**Faculty A:** It's an additional cost; it's really that simple. So if it's an additional cost, you can make that argument, but you've got to keep it consistent. You can't say it pushes people out with one fee, but it won't push people out when it's another. That's just ridiculous.

**Goldstein:** Well, certainly, we can make just as much money by charging all the college employees for parking.

**Faculty A:** I absolutely support it, and you should advocate for it, because we're the highest income people at this institution.

**Goldstein:** And as I said yesterday, too, I don't have the authority to do that. That has to be negotiated.

**Faculty A:** You brought it up here.

**Goldstein:** It's not the first time. I've brought it up over the years, supporting it.

**Student B:** That seems like an incredible idea you've brought up through the years, Mr. Goldstein. Seriously, students will support you. Why don't we help you advocate for that! Because here is my position as a student, and it's something that's incredibly offensive, and I would take caution in saying that in front of our divisive students. It's offensive for you to stand up there and say that students who have cars tend to have more money than students without cars. Let me tell you something. I drive a health hazard. Would it not be for that bucket that gets me from here to four other jobs so that I can maintain a family with my mom and my disabled sister, I would not be here. Furthermore, I did not purchase a parking permit this semester, because I was too busy trying to purchase a textbook, which Financial Aid cannot cover at this point, because each textbook is running \$60 and \$75. So it's either get a textbook and pass the class or get a permit. I think it's reasonable to say that students will pick a textbook. And you're talking and attacking assumptions, but the biggest assumption you're making in your argument is to assume that a student with a car has more money. Please, let's walk out to the parking lot. I will show you my 1997 Cavalier with no airbags and dents on each side. I'd be more than happy to show it to you. That is a ridiculous assumption, with all due respect.

**Goldstein:** As is the assertion that every student who owns a car has your story.

**Student B:** This is City College. I don't know if you've heard: it was built for the working class.

**Goldstein:** I take offense at that.

**Student B:** No. You should take offense to what you just said.

**Goldstein:** Let me just conclude our meeting by saying to you we shouldn't even be here, OK? The state of California has abandoned funding for higher education. It's accelerating. It's not slowing down. The college lost 20 million dollars of state funding to pay for the people who provide services and instruction to students, and we may lose more of it, beyond the 20 million next year. The workforce went through a round of wage cuts, and that has now come to an end. And so, here we are, talking about something like parking fees. We're also going to be talking about getting the voters of San Francisco to try to help us, but that's going to be way down the road. The budget solution does not rest on parking fees. It's just one of a dozen things in that chart that was referred to before. But it is one of them, and so there will be critics at every one of them. And if they all get knocked off—and they're not all fees for students, obviously, and that's a distinction—then we are going to be looking at a very, very serious situation between now and June 30. And I wish we didn't have to. Thank you.

**END: Approximately 3:00PM**

Prepared by the Executive Secretary, Associated Student Council: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Benjamin Ruppert)

Approved by VP of Administration, Associated Student Council: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Julie Du)

Approved by Associate Dean of Student Activities: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Samuel Santos)