

**COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES**

980 NINTH STREET, SUITE 300  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814  
PHONE: (916) 323-3562  
FAX: (916) 445-0278  
E-mail: csminfo@csm.ca.gov



March 17, 2003

Mr. Keith Petersen  
SixTen and Associates  
5252 Balboa Avenue, Suite 807  
San Diego, CA 92117

*And Interested Parties and Affected State Agencies (See Enclosed Mailing List)*

**RE: Final Staff Analysis and Hearing Date**

*Enrollment Fee Collection, 99-TC-13*

Los Rios Community College District, Claimant

Education Code Section 76300, Statutes 1984xx, Chapter 1 et al.; California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Sections 58500 – 58508.

*Enrollment Fee Waivers, 00-TC-15*

Glendale Community College District, Claimant

Education Code Section 76300, Statutes 1984xx, Chapter 1 et al.; California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Sections 58600, 58601, 58610 – 58613, 58620, 58630; Board of Governors Fee Waiver Program Manual for 2000/2001.

Dear Mr. Petersen:

The final staff analysis of this test claim has been completed and is enclosed for your review.

**Hearing**

This test claim is set for hearing on **Thursday, March 27, 2003**, at 9:30 a.m. in Room 126 of the State Capitol, Sacramento, California. Please let us know in advance if you or a representative of your agency will testify at the hearing, or if other witnesses will appear.

**Special Accommodations**

For any special accommodations such as a sign language interpreter, an assistive listening device, materials in an alternative format, or any other accommodations, please contact the Commission Office at least five to seven *working* days prior to the meeting.

If you have any questions, please contact Eric Feller at (916) 323-8221.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Paula Higashi".

Paula Higashi  
Executive Director

Enc. Final Staff Analysis

cc. Mailing List (current mailing list attached)

J:\MANDATES\2000\tc\99TC13\fsaltr.doc

MAILED: 3/17/03  
FAXED: VS  
DATE: 3/17/03  
CHRON: FILE:  
WORKING BINDER: \_\_\_\_\_

**ITEM 2**  
**TEST CLAIM**  
**FINAL STAFF ANALYSIS**

Education Code Section 76300;  
Statutes 1984xx, Chapter 1; Statutes 1984, Chapters 274 and 1401;  
Statutes 1985, Chapters 920 and 1454; Statutes 1986, Chapters 46 and 394;  
Statutes 1987, Chapter 1118; Statutes 1989, Chapter 136; Statutes 1991, Chapter 114;  
Statutes 1992, Chapter 703; Statutes 1993, Chapters 8, 66, 67, and 1124;  
Statutes 1994, Chapters 153 and 422; Statutes 1995, Chapter 308;  
Statutes 1996, Chapter 63; and Statutes 1999, Chapter 72;  
California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Sections 58500 – 58508

*Enrollment Fee Collection*

and

Education Code Section 76300  
Statutes 1984xx, Chapter 1; Statutes 1984, Chapters 274 and 1401;  
Statutes 1985, Chapters 920 and 1454; Statutes 1986, Chapters 46 and 394;  
Statutes 1987, Chapter 1118; Statutes 1989, Chapter 136;  
Statutes 1993, Chapters 8, 66, 67, and 1124; Statutes 1994, Chapters 153 and 422;  
Statutes 1995, Chapter 308; Statutes 1996, Chapter 63; and Statutes 1999, Chapter 72;  
California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Sections 58600, 58601, 58610 – 58613, 58620, 58630  
Board of Governors Fee Waiver Program Manual for 2000/2001

*Enrollment Fee Waivers*

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**Background**

Claimant Los Rios Community College District (LRCCD), submitted the *Enrollment Fee Collection* test claim (99-TC-13) in June 2000 alleging a reimbursable state mandate for community college districts by requiring specific new activities and costs related to collecting enrollment fees. Claimant Glendale Community College District (GCCD) submitted the *Enrollment Fee Waivers* (00-TC-15) test claim in May 2001 alleging a reimbursable state mandate for community college districts by requiring specific new activities and costs related to granting fee waivers, Board of Governor's Grants (BOG grants) and financial assistance to students. In August 2002, the *Enrollment Fee Collection* (99-TC-13) and *Enrollment Fee Waiver* (00-TC-15) test claims were consolidated.

In its most recent comments on the draft staff analysis, DOF concurs that calculating and collecting the student enrollment fee for each student who is not exempt from the fee is a state-mandated activity within the scope of the test claim. DOF also concurs that two activities are not

reimbursable state-mandated activities: (1) determining the number of credit courses for each student subject to the enrollment fees, and (2) preparing and submitting reports regarding enrollment fees collected. DOF does not agree with the draft analysis finding of state-reimbursable mandated costs for the rest of the activities discussed in the analysis.

In its comments on the *Enrollment Fee Collection* (99-TC-13), the Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCC) concludes that the test claim statute was "clearly a higher level of service for community colleges." The CCC provides a bill analysis from the Legislative Analyst quoting its conclusion that the two percent revenue credit is an insufficient reimbursement for the locally mandated fee-collection program. The CCC did not comment on the *Enrollment Fee Waivers* (00-TC-15) test claim.

## Conclusion

For reasons specified in the analysis, staff concludes that the test claim legislation imposes a partial reimbursable state-mandated program on community college districts within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution and Government Code section 17514 for the following activities:

- Calculating and collecting the student enrollment fee for each student enrolled except for nonresidents, and except for special part-time students cited in section 76300, subdivision (f). (Ed. Code, § 76300, subs. (a) & (b); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, §§ 58501, 58502 & 58503.);
- Exempting or waiving student fees in accordance with the groups listed in Education Code section 76300, subdivisions (e), (g) and (h);
- Waiving fees for students who apply for and are eligible for Board of Governor's (BOG) fee waivers (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, §§ 58612, 58613 & 58620.);
- Reporting to the CCC the number of and amounts provided for BOG fee waivers. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 58611.);
- (1) Documenting public benefits for recipients of Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary program (SSI/SSP), and General Assistance, or (2) Documenting those eligible for BOG fee waivers under income standards; and (3) for new directors/managers/ coordinators/officers in charge of day-to-day operations of the financial aid office, attending training offered by the Chancellor's Office within the first year of their appointment. (Cal. Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, Board of Governors Fee Waiver Program and Special Programs, 2000-2001 Program Manual, effective July 1, 2000 – June 30, 2001, Sections 4.2.2, 4.3.4 & 11.3);
- Adopting procedures that will document all financial assistance provided on behalf of students pursuant to chapter 9 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations; and including in the procedures the rules for retention of support documentation which will enable an independent determination regarding accuracy of the district's certification of need for financial assistance. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 58630, subd. (b).)

Staff also finds that all other test claim statutes, regulations, and executive orders (including the remainder of the BOG Fee Waiver Program Manual) not cited above do not impose reimbursable state-mandated activities within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6.

**Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the staff analysis and approve the test claim for the activities listed above.

Should the Commission adopt staff's recommendation to approve this test claim, any offsets<sup>1</sup> would be identified as such in the parameters and guidelines.

---

---

<sup>1</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1183.1, subdivision (a), paragraphs (8) and (9).

## STAFF ANALYSIS

### Claimants

Los Rios Community College District (99-TC-13)  
Glendale Community College District (00-TC-15)

### Chronology

6/22/00 Claimant LRCCD files *Enrollment Fee Collection* test claim (99-TC-13) with the Commission

8/2/00 DOF files request for extension to submit comments (99-TC-13)

8/4/00 The CCC files comments on the test claim with the Commission (99-TC-13)

9/1/00 DOF files request for extension to submit comments (99-TC-13)

10/13/00 DOF files comments on the test claim with the Commission (99-TC-13)

11/9/00 Claimant LRCCD files response to DOF and CCC comments (99-TC-13).

6/4/01 Claimant GCCD files *Enrollment Fee Waivers* test claim (00-TC-15) with the Commission

7/6/01 DOF requests an extension of time to file comments (00-TC-15)

8/8/01 DOF requests an extension of time to file comments (00-TC-15)

9/25/01 DOF files comments on the test claim (00-TC-15) with the Commission

11/12/01 Claimant GCCD files response to DOF comments (00-TC-15)

7/5/02 Commission issues draft staff analysis for *Enrollment Fee Collection* (99-TC-13)

7/9/02 LRCCD claimant's representative faxes a statement that claimant will not respond to the draft staff analysis (99-TC-13)

7/24/02 DOF requests extension of time to submit comments on the draft staff analysis (99-TC-13)

7/25/02 Commission approves DOF's extension to comment on the draft staff analysis (99-TC-13)

8/30/02 DOF submits comments on the draft staff analysis for *Enrollment Fee Collection* (99-TC-13)

8/30/02 Commission issues notice of consolidation of test claims *Enrollment Fee Collection* (99-TC-13) and *Enrollment Fee Waivers* (00-TC-15)

1/8/03 Commission issues new draft staff analysis for *Enrollment Fee Collection* (99-TC-13) and *Enrollment Fee Waivers* (00-TC-15)

1/17/03 Claimant submits comments on the draft staff analysis for *Enrollment Fee Collection* (99-TC-13) and *Enrollment Fee Waivers* (00-TC-15)

1/29/03 DOF requests extension of time to submit comments on the draft staff analysis

1/31/03 Commission approves time extension for DOF to submit comments on the draft staff analysis

- 2/25/03      DOF submits comments on the draft staff analysis for *Enrollment Fee Collection* (99-TC-13) and *Enrollment Fee Waivers* (00-TC-15)
- 3/14/03      Commission issues final staff analysis for *Enrollment Fee Collection* (99-TC-13) and *Enrollment Fee Waivers* (00-TC-15)

## Background

There are currently 72 community college districts governing 108 community colleges in California, serving over 2.9 million students.<sup>2</sup>

Claimant Los Rios Community College District (LRCCD) filed the *Enrollment Fee Collection* test claim (99-TC-13) on June 22, 2000. Originally enacted in 1984 and amended throughout the 1980s and 1990s, the original test claim legislation and regulations<sup>3</sup> authorize and require community colleges to implement enrollment fees and adopt regulations for their collection. Although the amount of the enrollment fee has been amended various times, the two percent of the fee retained by the community colleges<sup>4</sup> has remained constant.

Claimant Glendale Community College District (GCCD) filed the *Enrollment Fee Waivers* (00-TC-15) test claim in May 2001 in which claimant pled fee-waiver statutes and regulations<sup>5</sup> that specify the groups of students for which fees are waived or exempted, and for whom Board of Governors Grants (BOG grants) are available. A BOG grant is an instrument used by a community college district to process financial assistance to a low-income student.<sup>6</sup> In 1993, the Legislature altered the BOG grant program, changing it from a fee-offset grant program to a fee-waiver program<sup>7</sup> (hereafter called BOG fee waivers). The regulations governing the program were left intact, and are part of this test claim.<sup>8</sup> Unless indicated otherwise, any reference to a BOG grant in this analysis should be understood to apply to a BOG fee waiver.

---

<sup>2</sup> California Community College Chancellor's Office website <<http://www.cccco.edu>> [as of Jan. 7, 2003].

<sup>3</sup> Education Code section 76300. Statutes 1984xx, chapter 1; Statutes 1984, chapters 274 and 1401; Statutes 1985, chapters 920 and 1454; Statutes 1986, chapters 46 and 394; Statutes 1987, chapter 1118; Statutes 1989, chapter 136; Statutes 1991, chapter 114; Statutes 1992, chapter 703; Statutes 1993, chapters 8, 66, 67, and 1124; Statutes 1994, chapters 153 and 422; Statutes 1995, chapter 308; Statutes 1996, chapter 63; and Statutes 1999, chapter 72. California Code of Regulations, title 5, sections 58500 – 58508.

<sup>4</sup> Education Code Section 76300, subdivision (c). This is called a "revenue credit" by the Community College Chancellor's Office.

<sup>5</sup> Education Code section 76300; California Code of Regulations, title 5, Sections 58600, 58601, 58610 – 58613, 58620, 58630, Executive Orders of the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office.

<sup>6</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 58601.

<sup>7</sup> Statutes 1993, chapter 1124 (Assem. Bill No. 1561).

<sup>8</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 5, sections 58600 to 58630.

In August 2002, the *Enrollment Fee Collection* (99-TC-13) and *Enrollment Fee Waiver* (00-TC-15) test claims were consolidated.<sup>9</sup>

### **Claimant's Contentions**

Claimant contends that the test claim legislation constitutes a reimbursable state-mandated program pursuant to article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution and Government Code section 17514.

In the *Enrollment Fee Collection* (99-TC-13) test claim, claimant requests reimbursement for the following activities:

- (1) determining the number of credit courses for each student subject to the student enrollment fees;
- (2) calculating and collecting student enrollment fees for each nonexempt student enrolled, and providing a waiver of student enrollment fees for exempt students;
- (3) calculating, collecting, waiving or refunding student enrollment fees due to subsequent timely program changes or withdrawal from school;
- (4) entering the student enrollment fee collection and waiver information into the district cashier system and data processing and accounting systems;
- (5) processing all agency billings for students whose student enrollment fees are waived;
- (6) preparing and submitting reports on student enrollment fees collected and waived as required by the Board of Governors and other state agencies. Claimant states that failure to implement this mandate would reduce the total district revenue by up to ten percent pursuant to Education Code section 76300, subdivision (d).

In the *Enrollment Fee Waivers* (00-TC-15) test claim, claimant seeks reimbursement for:

- (1) determining and classifying students eligible for Board of Governors grants ("BOG grants") according to the eligibility criteria;
- (2) determining at the time of enrollment whether fees should be waived because the student is a recipient of benefits under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC)<sup>10</sup> program or the Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary program (SSI/SSP) or a beneficiary under a general assistance program;

---

<sup>9</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1183.06.

<sup>10</sup> On August 22, 1996, President Clinton signed into law H.R. 3734 --The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. This federal legislation eliminated the AFDC program and replaced it with the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program. This federal welfare reform offered states flexibility to redesign their programs, and subjected states to financial penalties for failing to meet work participation and other requirements. In response, California created the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program—(Stats. 1997, ch. 270; Assem. Bill No. 1542, Ducheny, Ashburn, Thompson, and Maddy). The AFDC and TANF programs are both referenced in the test claim legislation, and are used interchangeably in this analysis.



- (3) determining at the time of enrollment whether fees should be waived for a student due to demonstration of financial need in accordance with federal methodology for determining expected family contribution of students seeking financial aid;
- (4) determining at the time of enrollment whether fees should be waived for a student because he or she is a dependent, or surviving spouse who has not remarried, of any member of the California National Guard who, in the line of duty and while in the active service of the state, was killed, died of a disability resulting from an event that occurred while in the active service of the state, or is permanently disabled as a result of an event that occurred while in active service to the state;
- (5) entering the enrollment fee waiver information into the district cashier system and data processing and accounting systems, and processing all agency billings for students whose fees are waived;
- (6) separately documenting and accounting for the funds allocated for collection of enrollment fees and financial assistance in order to enable an independent determination regarding the accuracy of the District's certification of need for financial assistance;
- (7) preparing and submitting reports regarding the number and amounts of the enrollment fees waived as required by the Board of Governors and other state agencies.

Claimant contends that state funds allocated pursuant to Education Code section 76300, subdivision (i), currently calculated at .91 per credit unit waived, are not sufficient to fund the mandate.<sup>11</sup>

In its January 17, 2002 comments on the draft staff analysis, claimants stated general agreement with the analysis, except for the exclusion of the costs associated with collecting enrollment fees from nonresident students, which is discussed below.

#### **Department of Finance's Contentions**

DOF submitted separate comments on the *Enrollment Fee Collection* (99-TC-13) and *Enrollment Fee Waivers* (00-TC-15) test claims, and commented on the draft staff analysis on *Enrollment Fee Collection*, all of which are discussed in detail below.

In its most recent (2/25/03) comments on the draft staff analysis of *Enrollment Fee Collection* (99-TC-13) and the *Enrollment Fee Waivers* (00-TC-15) test claims, DOF concurs that calculating and collecting the student enrollment fee for each student who is not exempt from the fee is a state-mandated activity within the scope of the test claim. DOF also concurs that two activities are not state reimbursable mandated activities: (1) determining the number of credit courses for each student subject to the enrollment fees, and (2) preparing and submitting reports regarding enrollment fees collected. DOF disagrees with the remainder of the conclusions in the draft staff analysis, which is discussed in more detail below.

#### **Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Contentions**

In its comments on the *Enrollment Fee Collection* (99-TC-13), the CCC concludes that the test claim statute was "clearly a higher level of service for community colleges." The CCC provides

---

<sup>11</sup> Declaration of Carrie Bray, Director of Accounting Services, Los Rios Community College District, June 22, 2000 (exhibit A).

(1) a bill analysis from the Legislative Analyst that concludes the two percent revenue credit is an insufficient reimbursement for the locally mandated fee-collection program, and (2) a letter from its president to the author of the fee legislation (exhibit C).

The CCC stresses that although the amount of the enrollment fee has varied, the two percent revenue credit for community colleges has remained constant. Finally, the CCC states that, for fiscal year 1998-99, the claimant LRCCD collected \$6.98 million in fees pursuant to Education Code section 76300, of which two percent, or \$139,610 was a revenue credit. Statewide, enrollment fees totaled over \$164 million, of which the two percent revenue credit totaled \$3.28 million.

The CCC did not provide comments on *Enrollment Fee Waivers* (00-TC-15).

### **Discussion**

In order for the test claim legislation to impose a reimbursable state-mandated program under article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution and Government Code section 17514, the statutory language must mandate a new program or create an increased or higher level of service over the former required level of service. "Mandates" as used in article XIII B, section 6, is defined to mean "orders" or "commands."<sup>12</sup> The California Supreme Court has defined "program" subject to article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution as a program that carries out the governmental function of providing a service to the public, or laws which, to implement a state policy, impose unique requirements on local governments and do not apply generally to all residents and entities in the state.<sup>13</sup> To determine if the "program" is new or imposes a higher level of service, a comparison must be made between the test claim legislation and the legal requirements in effect immediately before the enactment of the test claim legislation.<sup>14</sup> Finally, the new program or increased level of service must impose "costs mandated by the state."<sup>15</sup>

This test claim presents the following issues:

- Is the test claim legislation subject to article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution?
- Does the test claim legislation impose a new program or higher level of service on community college districts within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution?
- Does the test claim legislation impose "costs mandated by the state" within the meaning of Government Code sections 17514 and 17556?

These issues are addressed as follows.

---

<sup>12</sup> *Long Beach Unified School District v. State of California* (1990) 225 Cal.App.3d 155, 174.

<sup>13</sup> *County of Los Angeles v. State of California* (1987) 43 Cal.3d 46, 56.

<sup>14</sup> *Lucia Mar Unified School Dist. v. Honig* (1988) 44 Cal.3d 830, 835.

<sup>15</sup> Government Code section 17514.

**Issue 1: Is the test claim legislation subject to article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution?**

In order for the test claim legislation to be subject to article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution, the legislation must constitute a “program,” which is defined as a program that carries out the governmental function of providing a service to the public, *or* laws which, to implement a state policy, impose unique requirements on local governments and do not apply generally to all residents and entities in the state.<sup>16</sup> Only one of these findings is necessary to trigger article XIII B, section 6.<sup>17</sup>

The test claim legislation concerns collecting community college enrollment fees and determining eligibility for fee waivers and financial aid. Collecting enrollment fees and providing waivers and financial aid is a peculiarly governmental function administered by community college districts as part of their mission to provide educational services to the students. Moreover, the test claim legislation imposes unique fee collection, fee waiver, refund eligibility determination, reporting and accounting requirements on community college districts that do not apply generally to all residents or entities in the state. Therefore, staff finds that community college enrollment fees, fee waivers, and BOG grants constitute a “program” within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution.

**Issue 2: Does the test claim legislation impose a new program or higher level of service on community college districts within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution?**

Article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution states, “whenever the Legislature or any state agency *mandates* a new program or higher level of service on any local government, the state shall provide a subvention of funds.” (Emphasis added.) This provision was specifically intended to prevent the state from forcing programs on local government that require them to spend their tax revenues.<sup>18</sup> To implement article XIII B, section 6, the Legislature enacted Government Code section 17500 et seq. Government Code section 17514 defines “costs mandated by the state” as “any increased costs which a local agency or school district is *required* to incur . . . as a result of any statute. . . . which *mandates* a new program or higher level of service of an existing program within the meaning of Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution.” (Emphasis added.) “Mandates” as used in article XIII B, section 6 has been defined to mean “orders” or “commands.”<sup>19</sup> If the test claim legislation does not mandate the school district to perform a task, then compliance is within the discretion of the school district and a state-mandated program does not exist. The state has no duty under article XIII B, section 6 to reimburse the school district for costs of programs or services incurred as a result of the exercise of local discretion or choice.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> *County of Los Angeles, supra*, 43 Cal.3d 46, 56.

<sup>17</sup> *Carmel Valley Fire Protection Dist.*, (1987), 190 Cal.App.3d 521, 537.

<sup>18</sup> *County of Fresno v. State of California* (1991) 53 Cal.3d 482, 487; *County of Los Angeles, supra*, 43 Cal.3d 46, 56; *County of Sonoma v. Commission on State Mandates* (2000) 84 Cal.App.4th 1264, 1283-1284.

<sup>19</sup> *Long Beach Unified School District, supra*, 225 Cal.App.3d 155, 174.

<sup>20</sup> *City of Merced v. State of California* (1984) 153 Cal.App.3d 777, 783.

To determine if the "program" is new or imposes a higher level of service, a comparison must be made between the test claim legislation and the legal requirements in effect immediately before the enactment of the test claim legislation.<sup>21</sup>

**Collection of enrollment fees:** Education Code section 76300 governs collection of enrollment fees as follows:<sup>22</sup>

- Subdivision (a) requires the governing board of each community college district to charge each student a fee.
- Subdivision (b) sets the fee at \$12 per unit per semester for 1998-99, and \$11 per unit per semester effective fall 1999-2000,<sup>23</sup> and requires the chancellor to proportionally adjust the fee for term lengths based on a quarter system.
- Subdivision (c) requires the chancellor, for computing apportionments to districts, to subtract from the total revenue owed to each district, 98 percent of the revenues received by districts from charging the fee.
- Subdivision (d) requires the chancellor to reduce apportionments by up to 10 percent to any district that does not collect the fee.
- Subdivision (f) authorizes the governing board of a community college district to exempt special part-time students admitted pursuant to section 76001 from the enrollment fee.

Under preexisting law, community colleges were authorized but not required to impose various student fees for the following: physical education courses using nondistrict facilities,<sup>24</sup> health services,<sup>25</sup> parking services,<sup>26</sup> transportation services,<sup>27</sup> program changes,<sup>28</sup> and late applications.<sup>29</sup>

As stated above, subdivision (f) authorizes but does not require the governing board of a community college district to exempt special part-time students admitted pursuant to Education Code section 76001 from the enrollment fee. This refers to students who attend a community college while in high school. Staff finds that admitting these students and exempting their fees

---

<sup>21</sup> *Lucia Mar Unified School Dist. v. Honig, supra*, 44 Cal.3d 830, 835.

<sup>22</sup> Waivers and exemptions pursuant to subdivisions (e), (g) and (h) will be discussed below.

<sup>23</sup> Statutes 1999, chapter 72 lowered the school year 1999-2000 fees from \$12 to \$11. Because chapter 72 became effective July 6, 1999 to be applied in fall 1999, it does not affect claimant's reimbursement period.

<sup>24</sup> Former Education Code section 72245 (exhibit D) and current Education Code section 76395.

<sup>25</sup> Former Education Code section 72246 (exhibit D) and current Education Code section 76355.

<sup>26</sup> Former Education Code section 72247 (exhibit D) and current Education Code section 76360.

<sup>27</sup> Former Education Code section 72248 (exhibit D) and current Education Code section 76361.

<sup>28</sup> Former Education Code sections 72250 – 72250.5 (exhibit D) and current California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 58507.

<sup>29</sup> Former Education Code section 72251 (exhibit D).

are discretionary activities, so collecting fees from them is not a new program or higher level of service within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6.

Additionally, prior to the test claim statute, there was no requirement to collect enrollment fees except for tuition from nonresident students.<sup>30</sup> Therefore, because it is not a new activity, staff finds that collecting fees from nonresident students is not a new program or higher level of service.

Claimant commented that although tuition fees were collected from nonresident students prior to 1975, that activity is not legally or factually relevant to the additional administrative procedures required to collect enrollment fees. Claimant points out there are no facts in the record that the fee collection procedures occur at the same time or location, are performed by the same staff members, or result in the same subsequent administrative burden (e.g., fees adjusted based on changes to class loads, student withdrawal, etc.). Therefore, according to claimant, the better conclusion of law would be that, to the extent that procedures for the collection of enrollment fees from nonresident students is different and exceeds the administrative tasks required to collect tuition fees from nonresident students, it is a new activity and a higher level of service.

In analyzing a test claim, staff identifies all the new activities or higher levels of service within the test claim legislation. If an activity in the test claim legislation appears to be the same or substantially the same as a pre-1975 activity, it does not qualify as a new program or higher level of service.<sup>31</sup> There is no evidence in the record that collecting tuition fees from nonresident students prior to 1975 is different from collecting enrollment fees from nonresident students after 1975. Therefore, without evidence to the contrary, staff's conclusion remains the same regarding nonresident student tuition.

In sum, staff finds that collecting enrollment fees constitutes a new program or higher level of service within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 for all students except for nonresidents, and except for special part-time students (pursuant to Ed. Code, § 76300, subd. (f)).

**Refunds for program changes:** California Code of Regulations, title 5, sections 58500 through 58508,<sup>32</sup> also pertain to community college student fees. Section 58500 defines the enrollment fee, section 58501 states the semester, quarter or fractional unit fee, section 58501.1 discusses the differential enrollment fee, section 58502 states the enrollment fee shall be charged at the time of enrollment, and section 58503 requires students to be charged for variable unit classes at the time of enrollment, based on the number of units in which the college enrolls the student. Section 58507 authorizes students to add or drop classes during the term pursuant to district policy, and requires the enrollment fee to be adjusted accordingly. Section 58508 governs refunds for program changes made during the first two weeks of instruction for a primary term-length course, or by the 10 percent point of the length of the course for a short-term course.

Prior law did not address enrollment fee refunds because there were no fees. Prior law did, however, require community colleges to impose a fee of \$10 per course, not to exceed \$20, for a

---

<sup>30</sup> Education Code section 76140.

<sup>31</sup> Subdivision (c) of section 6 of Article XIII B states that the Legislature may, but need not provide subvention of funds for mandates enacted prior to January 1, 1975.

<sup>32</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 58509 was not pled by claimant. This analysis does not address section 58509.

student program change consisting of dropping one or more courses any time after two weeks from the commencement of instruction in any term. In 1987, this fee was made permissive and was not to exceed one dollar (\$1) "for the actual pro rata cost for services relative to a program change consisting of adding or dropping one or more courses any time after two weeks from the commencement of instruction in any term."<sup>33</sup>

Staff finds that refunding enrollment fees is not a new program or higher level of service.

In disputing that program changes constitute a new program or higher level of service, DOF points out that section 58507 of the regulations authorizes, but does not require community colleges to allow students to add or drop classes during the term. Section 58507 states:

A community college district may allow a student to add or drop classes during the term pursuant to district policy. The enrollment fee or differential enrollment fee shall be adjusted to reflect added or dropped courses as allowed by district policy.

The claimant argues that this regulation was adopted as a result of the establishment of enrollment fees, and the need to refund fees is a foreseeable consequence of collecting them. Claimant says it is properly an activity to be included in the cost mandated by the state subject to reimbursement.

Staff agrees with DOF that allowing a student to add or drop courses is not required. Allowing the program changes pursuant to section 58507 is an activity that is not required. The statute states that a "community college **may** allow a student to add or drop classes" (emphasis added). Use of the word "may" is permissive.<sup>34</sup> Thus, changing programs is an activity within the discretion of the community college district to allow. The court of appeal has concluded that discretionary actions of local agencies are not new programs or higher levels of service within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution.<sup>35</sup> In *City of Merced*, the court found that the exercise of eminent domain was discretionary and therefore not a cost which plaintiff was required or mandated to incur. The same is true in section 58507, which authorizes but does not require community colleges to allow program changes. Therefore, staff finds that section 58507 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations is not a new program or higher level of service because the community college district is authorized but not required to allow a student to add or drop classes.

Section 58508 provides:

- (a) A community college district governing board shall refund upon request any enrollment fee paid by a student pursuant to Sections 58501 or 58501.1 for program changes made during the first two weeks of instruction for a primary term – length course, or by the 10 percent point of the length of the course for a short-term course.
- (b) A student shall be allowed at least two weeks from the final qualifying date of the program change specified in Subsection (a) to request an enrollment fee refund.

---

<sup>33</sup> Former Education Code sections 72250 and 72250.5 (exhibit D). Both statutes excused the fee for changes initiated or required by the community college.

<sup>34</sup> Education Code section 75.

<sup>35</sup> *City of Merced v. State of California* (1984) 153 Cal.App.3d 777, 783.

- (c) A community college district shall not refund any enrollment fee paid by a student for program changes made after the first two weeks of instruction for a primary term-length course, or after the 10 percent point of the length of the course for a short-term course, unless the program change is a result of action by the district to cancel or reschedule a class or to drop a student pursuant to section 55202 (g) where the student fails to meet a prerequisite.
- (d) When refunding an enrollment fee pursuant to Subsection (a), a community college district may retain once each semester or quarter an amount not to exceed \$10.00.

The refund requirement of section 58508 is triggered by the district's discretionary decision to allow program changes pursuant to section 58507. Therefore, staff finds that issuing refunds for program changes pursuant to sections 58507 and 58508 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations is not a new program or higher level of service.

**Fee exemptions and waivers:** The fee exemption and waiver provisions of Education Code section 76300 provide as follows:

- Subdivision (e) exempts the enrollment fee for (1) students enrolled in noncredit courses designated by section 84757; (2) California State University (CSU) or University of California (UC) students enrolled in remedial classes provided on a CSU or UC campus for whom the district claims an attendance apportionment pursuant to an agreement between the district and the CSU or UC; (3) students enrolled in credit contract education courses under certain conditions.
- Subdivision (f) authorizes (but does not require) fee exemption for special part-time students admitted pursuant to Education Code section 76001.
- Subdivision (g) requires fees to be waived for recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) or SSI/SSP, or a general assistance program, or those who demonstrate financial need in accordance with federal methodology. The fee waiver is also required for students who demonstrate eligibility according to income standards established by the Board of Governors and section 58620 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations.
- Subdivision (h) requires a fee waiver for dependents or unmarried surviving spouses of members of the California National Guard who die or become permanently disabled as a result of an event that occurred during active service of the state.
- Subdivision (i) states legislative intent to fund fee waivers for students who demonstrate eligibility pursuant to subdivisions (g) and (h), and requires the Board of Governors to allocate to districts two percent of the fees waived pursuant to those subdivisions. Subdivision (i) also requires the Board of Governors, from funds provided in the annual Budget Act, to allocate to districts \$.91 per credit unit waived pursuant to subdivisions (g) and (h) for determination of financial need and delivery of student financial aid services.

Prior law did not require fee exemptions or waivers because there were no enrollment fees.

Staff finds that waiving or exempting fees for student applicants is a new program or higher level of service.

The DOF, in its 9/25/01 comments, notes that the determinations for fee waiver eligibility required by Education Code section 76300, subdivisions (g) and (h) are alternative methods for determining student eligibility for BOG fee waivers and not additional requirements. As students receive Board of Governors fee waivers without achieving any of the criteria listed above, by meeting income limits, an eligibility determination is not necessarily contingent on performance of any of these activities and they should not be considered higher levels of service. Furthermore, according to DOF the analysis of BOG grant determinations pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 58620 focuses on every activity, requirement, and criteria for determining Board of Governors eligibility, so any costs identified with section 58620 would include these activities. Waiving fees pursuant to BOG fee waivers is discussed below.

In its 8/30/02 comments, DOF contends that waiving fees is not an "activity," but the preclusion of participation in the new program of collecting enrollment fees. DOF cites language in the Board of Governors Fee Waiver Program Manual for 2001/2002, stating that waivers are simply a transaction in which no money is received. DOF argues that upon proof of eligibility for a waiver, the community colleges neither provide anything to, nor collect anything from, the student. DOF concludes that since fee waivers prohibit colleges from participation in the new program of enrollment fees, for this particular test claim, providing fee waivers for exempt students is not a state-mandated activity. DOF admits that the fee waiver is granted "upon proof of eligibility."<sup>36</sup>

In its 2/25/03 comments, DOF states that section 76300, subdivision (e), specifies groups of students for which the fee requirement does not apply, which students are not required to have the fee waived as in subdivisions (g) and (h). Since these students<sup>37</sup> pay no enrollment fees, they have no need for waivers. DOF argues that since there is no waiver eligibility determination required, there is no mandated activity associated with section 76300, subdivision (e).

Staff disagrees. Each community college applies the same exemption or waiver provisions of section 76300 to waive or exempt the student fee.

DOF also states in its 2/25/03 comments that the burden of demonstrating fee waiver eligibility rests with the student, not the financial aid office. DOF quotes section 76300, subdivision (g), emphasizing the student's responsibility to demonstrate financial need and eligibility. There is nothing in section 76300, according to DOF, that requires the institution to establish the financial aid group to which the student belongs.

---

<sup>36</sup> Education Code section 76300, subdivision (g) reads in pertinent part, "The governing board of a community college district also shall waive the fee requirements of this section for any student **who demonstrates eligibility** according to income standards established by the Board of Governors and contained in section 58620 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations." (Emphasis added.) Education Code section 76300, subdivision (i)(1) reads in pertinent part "It is the intent of the Legislature that sufficient funds be provided to support the provision of a fee waiver for every student **who demonstrates eligibility** pursuant to subdivisions (g) and (h). (Emphasis added.)

<sup>37</sup> Students specified in section 76300, subdivision (e) are those (1) enrolled in noncredit courses designated by section 84757; (2) CSU or UC students in remedial classes for whom the district claims an attendance apportionment pursuant to an agreement between the district and CSU or UC; and (3) students enrolled in credit contract education courses under certain conditions.



Staff disagrees. As with fee exemptions above, a community college has no discretion to grant a fee waiver. If a student demonstrates eligibility pursuant to the test claim statute, he or she is entitled to the waiver. Payment of the fee or provision for its exemption or waiver is a transaction,<sup>38</sup> and as such, cannot be achieved unilaterally.

Community colleges must waive or exempt student fees required (not authorized) by section 76300, which lists the following groups, one of which a student must belong to in order qualify for the exemption or waiver.

- (1) A student enrolled in noncredit courses designated by section 84757 (e.g., courses on parenting, English as a second language, those for immigrants eligible for educational services in citizenship, etc.);
- (2) A CSU or UC student enrolled in remedial classes provided on a CSU or UC campus for whom the district claims an attendance apportionment pursuant to an agreement between the district and the CSU or UC;
- (3) A student enrolled in credit contract education courses pursuant to section 78021, if the entire cost of the course, including administrative costs, is paid by the public or private agency, corporation, or association with which the district is contracting and if the student is not included in the calculation of the district's average daily attendance;
- (4) A recipient of benefits under the AFDC, SSI/SSP, or a general assistance program, or has demonstrated financial need in accordance with the methodology set forth in federal law or regulation for determining the expected family contribution of students seeking financial aid.
- (5) A student who demonstrates eligibility according to income standards established by the Board of Governors and contained in section 58620 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations (this section relates to BOG fee waivers, discussed below).
- (6) A student who, at the time of enrollment is a dependent, or surviving spouse who has not remarried, of any member of the California National Guard who, in the line of duty and while in the active service of the state (as defined), was killed, became permanently disabled, or died of a disability resulting from an event that occurred while in the active service of the state.

Staff finds that waiving or exempting fees for each student applicant in accordance with the groups listed in Education Code section 76300, subdivisions (e), (g) and (h), is a new program or higher level of service.

Eligibility for a Board of Governors fee waiver is included by reference<sup>39</sup> in Education Code section 76300, subdivision (g), which requires the governing board of a community college district to waive the fee requirements "for any student who demonstrates eligibility according to income standards established by the Board of Governors and contained in Section 58620 of the

---

<sup>38</sup> Section 7.3 of the BOG Fee Manual states that "waivers are simply a transaction in which no money is received." One definition of transaction is "a communicative action or activity involving two parties or two things reciprocally affecting or influencing each other." (Webster's 3d New Internat. Dict. (1993) p. 2425.)

<sup>39</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 58620.

California Code of Regulations.” Since claimant also pled section 58620 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, it is discussed separately below.

### **Board of Governors Grants**

**BOG grant regulations:** California Code of Regulations, title 5, sections 58600 - 58630 govern the distribution of a BOG grant, which is “an instrument used by a community college district to process the financial assistance provided to a low-income student.”<sup>40</sup> In 1993, the Legislature altered the BOG grants program,<sup>41</sup> changing it from a fee-offset grant program to a fee-waiver program. The regulations governing the program were left intact. Therefore, as stated above, references to BOG grants herein should be read to apply to BOG fee waivers.

Section 58611 requires community college districts to report to the CCC the number of and amounts provided for BOG grants. Section 58612 requires a district to provide BOG grants “to all students who are eligible and who apply for this assistance.” This section also states a presumption of student eligibility for the remainder of the academic year until the beginning of the following fall term, and states that nothing in the chapter prohibits community college districts from establishing an application deadline for BOG grants. Section 58613 requires BOG grants to be made in the amount of enrollment fees calculated after program changes (pursuant to section 58507, discussed above). Section 58620 lists the eligibility criteria for a BOG grant, which is California residency and one of the criteria under the rubric of either (1) income standards;<sup>42</sup> (2) recipient of AFDC benefits described in Education Code section 76300, subdivision (g);<sup>43</sup> or (3) need-based financial aid eligibility.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 58601.

<sup>41</sup> Statutes 1993, chapter 1124 (Assem. Bill No. 1561). Herein referred to as a BOG fee-waiver.

<sup>42</sup> The income standards are: (A) be single and independent student having no other dependents and whose total income in the prior year was equal to or less than 150% of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) Poverty Guidelines for a family of one. Or be a married, independent student having no dependents other than a spouse, whose total income of both student and spouse in the prior year was equal to or less than 150% of the HHS Poverty Guidelines for a family of two. (B) Be a student who is dependent in a family having a total income in the prior year equal to or less than 150% of the HHS Poverty Guidelines for a family of that size, not including the student’s income, but including the student in the family size. (C) Provide documentation of taxable or untaxed income. (D) Be a student who is married or a single head of household in a family having a total income in the prior year equal to or less than 150% of the HHS Poverty Guidelines for a family of that size. (E) Be an independent student whose estimated family contribution as determined by federal methodology is equal to zero or a dependent student for whom the parent portion of the estimated family contribution as determined by federal methodology is equal to or less than zero. (F) For purposes of this subsection HHS Poverty guidelines used each year shall be the most recently published guidelines immediately preceding the academic year for which a fee waiver is requested.

<sup>43</sup> The benefits described in Education Code section 76300, subdivision (g) are for recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children, the general assistance program, or demonstration of financial need in accordance with the methodology set forth in federal law or regulation for determining the expected family contribution of students seeking financial aid. Subsection (2)

Prior law did not require community colleges to provide BOG grants to students.

In its 9/25/01 comments, DOF asserts that much of the infrastructure for determining whether a student is eligible to have fees waived already existed prior to 1975. For example, Education Code section 76355<sup>45</sup> requires the governing board of a community college district to adopt rules and regulations that either exempt low-income students from any health service fee or provide for the payment of the fee from other sources. Education Code section 69648 requires the community colleges to adopt rules and regulations to, among other activities, identify students who would be eligible for extended opportunity programs and services (EOPS) based on socioeconomic disadvantages. Both of these sections existed when enrollment fee waivers were implemented in 1984 and still exist. DOF argues that section 58620 of the California Code of Regulations merely clarifies the process for identifying low-income students and does not constitute a higher level of service.

Claimant rebuts DOF, arguing that the legislation enacting the health fee merely required adoption of rules and regulations that either exempt "low-income" students or provide for payment of fees from other sources. But the legislation provided no guidance or direction as to the method or means to determine whether a student was "low-income," and said nothing of the BOG grant factors of section 58620 of the California Code of Regulations. Claimant states that DOF's argument fails because there was no "infrastructure" to determine the specific requirements of section 58620 until 1987. Claimant also notes that the existence of "infrastructure," or lack thereof, is not one of the statutory exceptions set forth in Government Code section 17556, and therefore irrelevant.

Staff finds that waiving student fees for students who apply for and are eligible for BOG fee waivers is a new program or higher level of service.

DOF's argument of 9/25/01 is unconvincing. The health fee promulgated in Education Code section 76355, cited by DOF, is not mandatory. Subdivision (b) states that the governing board "may decide whether the fee shall be mandatory or optional." Since the health fee program is optional, the "infrastructure" for determining eligibility for it that DOF cites is also optional.

---

also lists: (A) At the time of enrollment be a recipient of benefits under the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) program. A dependent student whose parents(s) or guardian(s) are recipients of TANF shall be eligible if the TANF program grant includes a grant for the student or if the TANF grant is the sole source of income for the parent or guardian. (B) At the time of enrollment, be a recipient of benefits under the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program. A dependent student whose parent(s) or guardian(s) are recipients of SSI shall be eligible if the SSI program grant is the sole source of income for the parent or guardian(s). (C) At the time of enrollment be a recipient of benefits under the General Assistance program. (D) Provide documentation that the student is [sic] a recipient of benefits under one of the programs identified in Education Code section 76300(g) and (h) at the time of enrollment. Documentation sufficient to meet the requirements of this subdivision shall provide official evidence of these benefits.

<sup>44</sup> Need-Based Financial Aid Eligibility means any student who has been determined financially eligible for federal and/or state needed [sic] based financial aid.

<sup>45</sup> Former Education Code section 72246 (exhibit D).

More importantly, nothing in the record indicates that a BOG fee waiver determination, or even a substantially similar determination, must be made for waiver of the optional health fee pursuant to section 76355, or the student's "social or economic disadvantages" to determine eligibility for the extended opportunity program pursuant to section 69648.<sup>46</sup>

In its 2/25/03 comments, DOF states that with the passage of Assembly Bill No. 1561 (Stats. 1993, ch. 1124), the BOG grant program was replaced with the BOG fee-waiver program. Consequently, DOF argues that regulations pertaining to BOG grants are obsolete. Since the program no longer exists, DOF asserts that determining the eligibility for BOG grants is not a mandate. Alternatively, DOF argues that even if BOG grants were not obsolete, demonstrating eligibility is the responsibility of the student, not the institution.

Staff disagrees. The regulations pertaining to the BOG grants are not invalid. Regulations have a strong presumption of regularity.<sup>47</sup> Even though it was changed from a fee-offset grant program to a fee-waiver program by Statutes 1993, chapter 1124, the BOG fee program still exists. The BOG grant regulations, sections 58600 to 58630 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, cite to three statutes for their authority: Education Code sections 66700, 70901, and 72252. These statutes are still in effect, except that section 72252<sup>48</sup> has been amended and renumbered to section 76300.<sup>49</sup> With the authority for the regulations still in effect, the regulations are valid.<sup>50</sup>

As to DOF's contention that documenting eligibility is the responsibility of the student, not the institution, staff disagrees. As with fee waivers and exemptions discussed above, a community college has no discretion to grant a BOG fee waiver. A student requirement to demonstrate financial need triggers a duty on the part of the college to waive the fee. Awarding the BOG fee waiver is a transaction,<sup>51</sup> and as such, cannot be achieved unilaterally.

---

<sup>46</sup> Eligibility for EOPs is stated in title 5, section 56220 of the California Code of Regulations, which were adopted in 1987. Eligibility criteria include California residency, less than 70 units of degree-credit completion, eligibility for a BOG grant pursuant to section 58620 (1) or (2), and be educationally disadvantaged as determined by the EOPS director or designee, who must consider specific factors.

<sup>47</sup> *Agricultural Labor Relations Board v. Superior Court* (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 392, 411.

<sup>48</sup> Section 76300 was enacted by Statutes 1995, chapter 308 due to the sunset of the prior section 76300. The community college fee statute has been at section 76300 since 1993 (Stats. 1993, ch. 8). Prior to that, it was in section 72252 since its enactment in 1984 (Stats. 1983-1984xx, ch. 1).

<sup>49</sup> A renumbered or restated statute is not a newly enacted provision. Education Code section 3 provides that "The provisions of this code, insofar as they are substantially the same as existing statutory provisions relating to the same subject matter, shall be construed as restatements and continuations, and not as new enactments." See also *In re Martin's Estate* (1908) 153 Cal. 225, 229, which held: "Where there is an express repeal of an existing statute, and a re-enactment of it at the same time, or a repeal and a re-enactment of a portion of it, the re-enactment neutralizes the repeal so far as the old law is continued in force. It operates without interruption where the re-enactment takes effect at the same time."

<sup>50</sup> *Agricultural Labor Relations Board v. Superior Court, supra*, 16 Cal.3d 392, 401.

<sup>51</sup> *Ante*, footnote 38.

Therefore, staff finds that waiving fees for students who apply for and are eligible for BOG fee waivers is a new program or higher level of service.

Districts are required to report to the CCC the number of and amounts provided for BOG fee waivers.<sup>52</sup> Because this is a new requirement, staff also finds that this reporting is a new program or higher level of service. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 58611).

**District reporting and accountability:** Claimant pled California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 58630. Subdivision (a) of this section requires districts to identify separately in district accounts dollars allocated for financial assistance. Subdivision (b) requires adoption of procedures to document all financial assistance provided on behalf of students pursuant to chapter 9 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations. The procedures must include rules for retention of support documentation that will enable an independent determination regarding accuracy of the district's certification of need for financial assistance.

Prior to adoption of section 58630, there was no requirement for community colleges to account for financial assistance funds separately in district accounts.

In its 2/25/03 comments, DOF argues that these activities relate to the administration of the funding mechanism for the obsolete BOG grant program, which was replaced by the BOG fee-waiver program in 1993. Since a fee waiver does not involve exchange of funds, the activities are no longer required.

Staff agrees that identifying dollars for financial assistance in separate district accounts pursuant to subdivision (a) is not a new program or higher level of service due to the BOG grant program's conversion to a BOG fee-waiver program. Fee waivers do not require dollars to be identified in district accounts as BOG grants did.

As to the activities in section 58630, subdivision (b), staff disagrees. It is possible for colleges to comply with this subdivision by documenting financial assistance provided on behalf of students, including rules to retain support documentation that would enable an independent determination regarding accuracy of the district's certification of need for financial assistance.

Therefore, staff finds that the following activities constitute a new program or higher level of service pursuant to section 58630 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations: adopting procedures that will document all financial assistance provided on behalf of students pursuant to chapter 9 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, and including in the authorized procedures rules for retention of support documentation which will enable an independent determination regarding accuracy of the district's certification of need for financial assistance.

**BOG grant executive orders:** Claimant alleges that the *Board of Governors Fee Waiver Program and Special Programs, 2000-2001 Program Manual* ("BOG Fee Manual")<sup>53</sup> is a state mandate. The BOG Fee Manual is issued by the CCC to assist community college financial aid

---

<sup>52</sup> This regulation states this pertains to BOG grants, but it would apply to BOG fee waivers now.

<sup>53</sup> California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, Board of Governors Fee Waiver Program and Special Programs, 2000-2001 Program Manual, effective July 1, 2000 – June 30, 2001.

staff,<sup>54</sup> and includes requirements for financial aid office staff. It contains interpretations of the student financial aid sections of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, and requires community college financial aid offices to perform documentation and training activities. Because the CCC enforces the title 5 regulations, the CCC's interpretation of the title 5 regulations is entitled to some consideration.<sup>55</sup> Therefore, staff finds that the BOG Fee Manual constitutes an executive order within the meaning of Government Code section 17516 to the extent that it contains requirements issued by a state agency.

In its 2/25/03 comments, DOF disagreed that the BOG Fee Manual is an executive order within the meaning of Government Code section 17516. According to DOF:

...we assert that a Chancellor's Office Manual, self-described as "sub-regulatory guidance," is not an executive order. ...the Chancellor's Office ... legal staff has verbally indicated that they do not believe that non-compliance with the BOGFW manual would result in any punitive action. This would be consistent with existing law (Ed. Code, §§ 70901 and 70901.5). As written in these sections, the BOGFW manual developed and distributed by the Chancellor's Office, is a technical assistance document, not a source of new mandates. Chancellor's Office staff indicates the BOGFW manual was not authorized nor adopted by the Board of Governor's.

Staff disagrees. Regarding opinions of the CCC, the Commission is not bound to rely on the legal opinions of the administering agency about what is or is not an executive order or regulation.<sup>56</sup> More importantly, Government Code section 17516 defines an executive order as "...any order, plan, requirement, rule, or regulation issued by ... any agency, department, board, or commission of state government." Because the BOG Fee Manual contains requirements, and is issued by the CCC (a state agency), staff finds that it qualifies as an executive order within the meaning of section 17516.

The 2000-2001 BOG Fee Manual requires the following activities:

- (1) Documenting public benefits for recipients of TANF, SSI/SSP, and General Assistance, (Section 4.2.2), or
- (2) Documenting those eligible under income standards (Section 4.3.4); and
- (3) Attending training offered by the Chancellor's Office within the first year of appointment for new directors/managers/ coordinators/officers in charge of day-to-day operations of the financial aid office (Section 11.3).

These are new requirements. Before the test claim legislation, there were no enrollment fees for which BOG fee waivers were needed.

---

<sup>54</sup> A copy of the BOG Fee Manual and other forms are available at the California Community College Chancellor's Office website: <<http://www.cccco.edu/divisions/ss/financial%20assistance/financial%5Fassistance.htm>> [as of Jan. 7, 2003].

<sup>55</sup> *Yamaha Corporation of America v. State Board of Equalization* (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 1, 15.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. *California Advocates for Nursing Home Reform v. Diana M. Bonta* (February 24, 2003, A097107) \_\_ Cal. Rptr. 2d \_\_ [03 D.A.R. 2011, 2011-2012] mod. March 12, 2003, 03 D.A.R. 2803.

DOF's 2/25/03 comments further state that should the manual be judged equivalent to a regulation, DOF disagrees with the magnitude of the mandated activities. According to DOF, documenting public benefits for recipients of TANF, SSI/SSP, and General Assistance, (Section 4.2.2), and documenting those eligible under income standards (Section 4.3.4) are the responsibility of the student and not the institution, and therefore are not mandates. As to the activity of attending training offered by the Chancellor's Office within the first year of appointment for new directors/managers/ coordinators/officers in charge of day-to-day operations of the financial aid office (Section 11.3), DOF states that only one person from each financial aid office would be required to attend training rather than all new directors, managers, coordinators and officers.

Regarding the first two documentation activities, staff disagrees with DOF. Like the fee exemptions and waivers discussed above, a community college has no discretion whether or not to document the basis for the waiver or exemption. A student requirement to demonstrate eligibility triggers a duty on the part of the college to receive evidence of that eligibility. It is a transaction,<sup>57</sup> and as such, cannot be achieved unilaterally. As to the frequency of the training raised by DOF, should the Commission approve this claim, this issue would be resolved in the parameters and guidelines phase.

Staff finds therefore, pursuant to the BOG Fee Manual, the following are new programs or higher levels of service: (1) documenting public benefits for recipients of TANF, SSI/SSP, and General Assistance, or documenting those eligible under income standards; and (2) for new directors/managers/coordinators/officers in charge of day-to-day operations of the financial aid office, attending training offered by the Chancellor's Office within the first year of appointment. (Cal. Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, Board of Governors Fee Waiver Program and Special Programs, 2000-2001 Program Manual, effective July 1, 2000 – June 30, 2001, Sections 4.2.2, 4.3.4 and 11.3). Staff finds that the remainder of the BOG Fee Manual is not a new program or higher level of service.

In summary, staff concludes that the test claim legislation imposes new programs or higher levels of service on community college districts within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution for the following activities:

- Calculating and collecting the student enrollment fee for each student enrolled except for nonresidents, and except for special part-time students cited in section 76300, subdivision (f). (Ed. Code, § 76300, subs. (a) & (b); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, §§ 58501, 58502 & 58503.);
- Exempting or waiving student fees in accordance with the groups listed in Education Code section 76300, subdivisions (e), (g) and (h);
- Waiving fees for students who apply for and are eligible for BOG fee waivers (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, §§ 58612, 58613 & 58620.);
- Reporting to the CCC the number of and amounts provided for BOG fee waivers. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 58611.);

---

<sup>57</sup> *Ante*, footnote 38.

- (1) Documenting public benefits for recipients of Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, SSI/SSP, and General Assistance, or (2) Documenting those eligible for BOG fee waivers under income standards; and (3) for new directors/managers/coordinators/officers in charge of day-to-day operations of the financial aid office, attending training offered by the Chancellor's Office within the first year of their appointment. (Cal. Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, Board of Governors Fee Waiver Program and Special Programs, 2000-2001 Program Manual, effective July 1, 2000 – June 30, 2001, Sections 4.2.2, 4.3.4 & 11.3);
- Adopting procedures that will document all financial assistance provided on behalf of students pursuant to chapter 9 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations; and including in the procedures the rules for retention of support documentation which will enable an independent determination regarding accuracy of the district's certification of need for financial assistance. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 58630, subd. (b).)

Additional activities pled by claimant include: "entering the student enrollment fee collection and waiver information into the district cashier system and data processing and accounting systems," and "determination of credit courses." These activities do not appear in the test claim statute or regulations and therefore would be more appropriately discussed in the parameters and guidelines<sup>58</sup> should the Commission approve this test claim.

**Issue 3: Do the test claim legislation and executive orders impose "costs mandated by the state" within the meaning of Government Code sections 17514 and 17556?**

In order for the activities listed above to impose a reimbursable state-mandated program under article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution, two criteria must apply. First, the activities must impose costs mandated by the state.<sup>59</sup> Second, no statutory exceptions as listed in Government Code section 17556 can apply. Government Code section 17514 defines "costs mandated by the state" as follows:

...any increased costs which a local agency or school district is required to incur after July 1, 1980, as a result of any statute enacted on or after January 1, 1975, or any executive order implementing any statute enacted on or after January 1, 1975, which mandates a new program or higher level of service of an existing program within the meaning of Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution.

Government Code section 17556, subdivision (d) precludes finding costs mandated by the state if after hearing, the Commission finds that the "local agency or school district has the authority to levy service charges, fees, or assessments sufficient to pay for the mandated program or increased level of service."

Government Code section 17556, subdivision (e) precludes findings costs mandated by the state if the test claim statute provides for offsetting savings which result in no net costs, or includes

<sup>58</sup> Government Code section 17557; California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1183.1.

<sup>59</sup> *Lucia Mar Unified School Dist.*, *supra*, 44 Cal.3d 830, 835; Government Code section 17514.



additional revenue that was specifically intended to fund the costs of the state mandate in an amount sufficient to fund it.

**Collection of enrollment fees (Ed. Code, § 76300, subs. (a) & (b); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, §§ 58501, 58502 & 58503.):** In response to the *Enrollment Fee Collection* test claim, the DOF originally commented that it mostly agrees that the test claim statutes constitute a new program or higher level of service “because community college districts had not previously been required to collect enrollment fees from students.” However, DOF concludes that reimbursement should be denied because the statutory scheme sets up a mechanism whereby community college districts are automatically provided with funding for their costs of administering the program.<sup>60</sup> Since collection of enrollment fees is entwined with the entire admission process, DOF argues it would be extremely difficult or impossible to accurately isolate the tasks involved with collecting enrollment fees. DOF submits that the Legislature has validly determined that two percent of the revenue from fees is adequate to compensate community college districts for administering the test claim statutes.

In its response, claimant first quotes the CCC’s comments, which like the test claim, note that colleges are compensated in the amount of two percent of the enrollment fees collected for the cost of collecting the enrollment fee. Claimant cites the legislative history provided by the CCC that quoted the Legislative Analyst’s conclusion that the two percent revenue credit was an insufficient reimbursement. Claimant goes on to quote the applicable provisions of Government Code section 17556, subdivisions (d) and (e), as follows:

The Commission shall not find costs mandated by the state, as defined in section 17514, in any claim submitted by a local agency or school district, if, after a hearing, the Commission finds that: [¶]...[¶]

(d) The local agency or school district has the **authority to levy** services charges, fees, or assessments **sufficient to pay** for the mandated program or increased level of service.

(e) **The statute or executive order provides for offsetting savings** to local agencies or school districts **which result in no net costs** to the local agencies or school districts, or includes **additional revenue that was specifically intended to fund the costs** of the state mandate in an **amount sufficient to fund the cost** of the state mandate. (Emphasis added by claimant).

Claimant asserts these two Government Code subdivisions require the Commission to make findings of law and fact. Regarding subdivision (d), it can be determined that as a matter of law, neither the test claim statutes nor other laws provide the “authority to levy service charges, fees, or assessments” for the collection of enrollment fees. The “revenue credit” is not a service fee, charge, or assessment upon the consumer (student) of a service provided by the college district. Regarding subdivision (e), as a matter of law, the test claim statutes do not include “offsetting savings” which result in no net costs. A new program was added, and no other mandated program was removed by the statute. However, as a matter of law, the test claim statutes did include “additional revenue that was specifically intended to fund the costs of the mandate” in the form of the revenue credit. According to the claimant, this begs the question of fact of

---

<sup>60</sup> Education Code, section 76300, subdivision (c) states that for purposes of computing apportionments to community college districts, the Chancellor shall subtract 98% of the revenues received by districts from enrollment fees from the total revenue owed to each district.

whether the additional revenue is "sufficient to fund the cost of the state mandate." The entire cost to implement the mandate will vary from district to district, so it cannot be determined as a matter of fact that the revenue credit is sufficient for any or all districts. The claimant notes the revenue credit can in the usual course of the mandate process be addressed by the annual claiming process whereby the claimants are required by law to report their cost of implementing the mandate from which they must deduct other reimbursement and funds, in this case, the two-percent revenue credit.

Regarding DOF's statement that the collection of enrollment fees is entwined with the entire admission process making it extremely difficult, if not impossible to accurately isolate the specific tasks involved with collecting enrollment fees, claimant notes this is without foundation, and is neither a statutory exception to reimbursement of costs mandated by the state, nor a practical argument. The parameters and guidelines determine which activities are reimbursable and the cost accounting methods to be used, and the claimants have the burden of complying with the parameters and guidelines, not the state. Also, enrollment fee collection involves a high volume of uniform transactions (collecting the fee) comprised of identifiable direct costs (staff time and forms to collect the fee). After several years of data are accumulated, claimant asserts that this mandate would be a candidate for a uniform cost allowance.

Staff finds the community colleges' revenue credit does not preclude reimbursement for the fee collection activities specified. Government Code section 17556, subdivision (d), by its express terms, only applies to "fees, or assessments **sufficient to pay** for the mandated program or increased level of service" (emphasis added). Likewise, subdivision (e) only applies to "revenue ...in an amount **sufficient to fund** the cost of the state mandate" (emphasis added). The record indicates that the revenue credit is insufficient to fund these activities.

The test claim statute reads in pertinent part as follows:

**76300.** (a) The governing board of each community college district shall charge each student a fee pursuant to this section. [¶]...[¶]

(c) For the purposes of computing apportionments to community college districts pursuant to Section 84750, the chancellor shall subtract from the total revenue owed to each district, 98 percent of the revenues received by districts from charging a fee pursuant to this section.

Claimant submitted a declaration that it incurred about \$677,640 (or \$4.60 per student) in staffing and other costs in excess of the two percent of the enrollment fees retained during July 1998 to June 1999.<sup>61</sup> The assertion of insufficient fee authority is supported by the LAO's legislative history submitted by the CCC.<sup>62</sup> Thus, staff finds that Government Code section 17556, subdivision (d) does not preclude reimbursement because the record indicates that the fee is not sufficient to pay for the program.

Similarly, staff finds that Government Code section 17556, subdivision (e) does not preclude reimbursement because there is nothing in the record to indicate that offsetting savings or

---

<sup>61</sup> Declaration of Carrie Bray, Director, Accounting Services, Los Rios Community College District, June 22, 2000 (exhibit A).

<sup>62</sup> Office of the Legislative Analyst, analysis of Assembly Bill No. 1 (1983-1984 2d Ex. Sess.) January 23, 1984, as submitted in the CCC comments (exhibit C).

additional revenue -- in this case the two percent revenue credit -- is sufficient to fund the mandate.<sup>63</sup>

Staff disagrees with DOF's assertion that the Legislature made a valid determination that two percent of the revenue from fees is adequate to compensate community college districts for administering the test claim statutes. DOF cites no authority for this proposition, nor is there statutory language in the test claim statute to support it.

Even if the Legislature had expressly determined the fee adequate, the determination would not prevent finding the existence of a mandate. Two cases have held legislative declarations unenforceable that attempt to limit the right to reimbursement. In *Carmel Valley Fire Protection District v. State of California*,<sup>64</sup> the court held that "Legislative disclaimers, findings and budget control language are no defense to reimbursement." The *Carmel Valley* court called such language "transparent attempts to do indirectly that which cannot lawfully be done directly."<sup>65</sup> Similarly, in *Long Beach Unified School District v. State of California*,<sup>66</sup> the Legislature deleted requested funding from an appropriations bill and enacted a finding that the executive order did not impose a state-mandated local program. The court held that "unsupported legislative disclaimers are insufficient to defeat reimbursement. ...[The district,] pursuant to Section 6, has a constitutional right to reimbursement of its costs in providing an increased service mandated by the state. The Legislature cannot limit a constitutional right."<sup>67</sup> If the Legislature could not prevent a mandate explicitly as the authorities indicate, it could not prevent one implicitly.

In its 8/30/02 comments on the draft staff analysis on the *Enrollment Fee Collection* test claim, DOF asserts that the community colleges have sufficient fee authority pursuant to Education Code section 70902, subdivision (b) (9), for enrollment fee collection. This statute covers fees of a governing board "as it is required to establish by law," or "as it is authorized to establish by law." The fees in existing law that fall within the authorization provided in section 70902, subdivision (b) (9) are for the following purposes: apprenticeship courses, health, parking and transportation, instructional materials, course auditing, student body center building and operations, fees for classes not eligible for state apportionments, and fees for physical education courses requiring use of nondistrict facilities.<sup>68</sup>

For fee authority pursuant to Education Code section 70902, subdivision (b) (9) to apply, it must be "required or authorized by law." There is nothing in the record to indicate the existence of any fee authority "required or authorized by law," for collecting enrollment fees other than that listed in Education Code section 76300. The record indicates this section 76300 authority is not "sufficient to pay for the mandated program" within the meaning of Government Code section

---

<sup>63</sup> Should the Commission approve staff's recommendation, the two percent fee would be determined to be an offset in the parameters and guidelines per California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1183.1, subdivision (a), paragraphs (8) and (9).

<sup>64</sup> *Carmel Valley*, *supra*, 190 Cal.App.3d at page 521.

<sup>65</sup> *Id.* at page 541.

<sup>66</sup> *Long Beach Unified*, *supra*, 225 Cal.App.3d 155.

<sup>67</sup> *Id.* at page 184.

<sup>68</sup> Education Code sections 76350 through 76395.

17556, subdivision (d). Therefore, staff finds that the fee authority in Education Code section 70902, subdivision (b) (9) does not preclude reimbursement under this test claim.

**BOG fee waivers & fee exemptions (Ed. Code, § 76300, subs. (e), (g) & (h); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, §§ 58612, 58613 & 58620.):** DOF argues that costs associated with BOG fee waivers should not be included in this claim because a statutory compensation mechanism currently exists for those costs. Education Code section 76300, subdivision (i), states legislative intent to provide sufficient funds for fee waivers for every student who demonstrates eligibility pursuant to subdivisions (g) and (h) (referring to students who receive TANF, SSI/SSP or other general assistance or dependents or surviving spouses of members of the California National Guard who are killed or permanently disabled in the line of duty). This section also requires the Community Colleges Board of Governors, from funds in the annual budget act, to allocate to community colleges two percent of the fees waived under subdivisions (g) and (h) of section 76300. Finally, this section requires the Board of Governors to allocate from funds in the annual budget act ninety-one cents (\$0.91) per credit unit waived pursuant to subdivisions (g) and (h) for determination of financial need and delivery of student financial aid services, on the basis of the number of students for whom fees are waived.

Thus, DOF argues that costs associated with fee waivers should not be included in the test claim.

In its 9/25/01 comments on the *Enrollment Fee Waivers* test claim (00-TC-15), DOF argued that funding is provided to cover costs associated with determining eligibility for BOG fee waivers. DOF disputes the number of fee waiver determinations pled by claimant, estimating it to be roughly 36 percent of the number asserted by claimant. DOF also asserts that the average time to make a fee waiver is overstated by claimant, since students only need to demonstrate that they meet one of the seven criteria. DOF says it believes that the total cost of the BOG fee waiver determination is less than \$70,000, and that the Glendale Community College District received \$66,000 for Student Financial Aid Administration and \$22,888 for Fee Waiver Administration, both allocated as authorized by Education Code section 76300, subdivision (i). DOF believes that eligibility determination is fully funded and not a reimbursable mandate.

In its 11/12/01 rebuttal to DOF's comments on *Enrollment Fee Waivers* (00-TC-15), claimant objects to DOF's comments as legally incompetent and in violation of California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1183.02(d) because (1) they are not signed under penalty of perjury by an authorized representative that they are true and complete to the best of the representative's personal knowledge or information and belief, and (2) they are not supported by documentary evidence authenticated by declarations under penalty of perjury (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 1183.02 (c)(2)). Claimant argues that DOF's comments constitute hearsay.

Claimant also disputes DOF's assertion of revenue sufficient to fund any requirements for determining eligibility for BOG fee waivers or fee exemptions. Claimant asserts that Government Code section 17556, subdivision (e), indicates that test claim statutes must include the offsetting revenue in the same legislation, and that claimant already identified the offsetting revenue in the test claim as 7 percent of the fees waived from July 1, 1999 through July 4, 2000 and at ninety-one cents (\$0.91) per credit unit waived thereafter pursuant to Education Code section 76300, subdivision (i)(2). Claimant asserts that the cost to implement the mandate will vary from district to district so it cannot be determined if this identified revenue is sufficient for any or all of them.

Staff finds that Education Code section 76300, subdivision (i), does not preclude finding a mandate for waiving fees pursuant to BOG fee waivers. Claimant's assertion in the record indicates that legislative allocations are not sufficient to pay for the waivers under the fee collection program. In sum, staff finds that neither Government Code section 17556, subdivisions (d) and (e), nor the statute's reimbursement mechanism, precludes reimbursement for costs associated with BOG fee waivers or fee exemptions. Should the Commission approve this test claim, revenue as a result of Education Code section 76300, subdivision (i), or any other source, would be determined as offsetting revenue in the parameters and guidelines.<sup>69</sup>

**District reporting and accountability (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 58630.):** In its 9/25/01 comments, DOF argues that the reporting and accounting activities do not constitute reimbursable mandates because claimant seeks reimbursement to document and account for funds allocated for collection of enrollment fees, but section 58630 only refers to identification and documentation of financial assistance, not enrollment fee collection. Therefore, any attempt to claim reimbursement for the accounting and documentation of enrollment fees should be denied. DOF also asserts that this activity receives funding from both the two percent funds for fee waiver administration and the seven percent fund for Student Financial Aid Administration.

DOF is correct in observing that section 58630 only pertains to financial assistance. As to prior receipt of funding, Education Code section 76300, subdivision (i)(2) states, "From funds provided in the annual Budget Act, the Board of Governors shall allocate to community college districts, pursuant to this subdivision, an amount equal to ninety-one cents (\$0.91) per credit unit waived pursuant to subdivision (g) and (h) **for determination of financial need and delivery of student financial aid services**, on the basis of the number of students for whom fees are waived." (Emphasis added.) This funding would be considered as an offset in the parameters and guidelines for this test claim should the Commission adopt this analysis.

In summary, there is nothing in the record to indicate that the Legislature repealed other programs or appropriated sufficient funds for enrollment fee collection or BOG fee waivers or fee exemptions.

### **Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing analysis, staff concludes that the test claim legislation imposes a partial reimbursable state-mandated program on community college districts within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution and Government Code section 17514 for the following activities:

- Calculating and collecting the student enrollment fee for each student enrolled except for nonresidents, and except for special part-time students cited in section 76300, subdivision (f). (Ed. Code, § 76300, subs. (a) & (b); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, §§ 58501, 58502 & 58503.);
- Exempting or waiving student fees in accordance with the groups listed in Education Code section 76300, subdivisions (e), (g) and (h);
- Waiving fees for students who apply for and are eligible for BOG fee waivers (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, §§ 58612, 58613 & 58620.);

---

<sup>69</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1183.1, subdivision (a), paragraphs (8) and (9).

- Reporting to the CCC the number of and amounts provided for BOG fee waivers. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 58611.);
- (1) Documenting public benefits for recipients of Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, SSI/SSP, and General Assistance, or (2) Documenting those eligible for BOG fee waivers under income standards; and (3) for new directors/managers/coordinators/officers in charge of day-to-day operations of the financial aid office, attending training offered by the Chancellor's Office within the first year of their appointment. (Cal. Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, Board of Governors Fee Waiver Program and Special Programs, 2000-2001 Program Manual, effective July 1, 2000 – June 30, 2001, Sections 4.2.2, 4.3.4 & 11.3);
- Adopting procedures that will document all financial assistance provided on behalf of students pursuant to chapter 9 of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations; and including in the procedures the rules for retention of support documentation which will enable an independent determination regarding accuracy of the district's certification of need for financial assistance. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 58630, subd. (b).)

Staff also finds that all other test claim statutes, regulations, and executive orders (including the remainder of the BOG Fee Waiver Program Manual) not cited above do not impose reimbursable state-mandated activities within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6.

#### **Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the staff analysis and approve the test claim for the activities listed above.

Should the Commission adopt staff's recommendation to approve this test claim, any offsets<sup>70</sup> would be identified as such in the parameters and guidelines.

---

<sup>70</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1183.1, subdivision (a), paragraphs (8) and (9).

# Commission on State Mandates

Original List Date: 8/7/2000  
Last Updated: 1/6/2003  
List Print Date: 03/17/2003  
Claim Number: 99-TC-13  
Issue: Enrollment Fee Collection

Mailing Information: Final Staff Analysis

## Mailing List

### Related Matter(s)

00-TC-15 Enrollment Fee Waivers

### TO ALL PARTIES AND INTERESTED PARTIES:

Each commission mailing list is continuously updated as requests are received to include or remove any party or person on the mailing list. A current mailing list is provided with commission correspondence, and a copy of the current mailing list is available upon request at any time. Except as provided otherwise by commission rule, when a party or interested party files any written material with the commission concerning a claim, it shall simultaneously serve a copy of the written material on the parties and interested parties to the claim identified on the mailing list provided by the commission. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 1181.2.)

---

Mr. Thomas J. Donner

Santa Monica Community College District  
1900 Pico Blvd.  
Santa Monica, CA 90405-1628

Tel: (310) 434-4201

Fax: (310) 434-8200

---

Mr. Jon Sharpe

Los Rios Community College District  
1919 Spanos Court  
Sacramento, CA 95825

**Claimant**

Tel: (559) 244-5910

Fax: (559) 243-1949

---

Mr. Allan Burdick

MAXIMUS  
4320 Auburn Blvd., Suite 2000  
Sacramento, CA 95841

Tel: (916) 485-8102

Fax: (916) 485-0111

---

Dr. Carol Berg

Education Mandated Cost Network  
1121 L Street, Suite 1060  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Tel: (916) 446-7517

Fax: (916) 446-2011

---

Mr. Keith Gmeinder

Department of Finance (A-15)  
915 L Street, 8th Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Tel: (916) 445-8913

Fax: (916) 327-0225

---

Mr. Keith B. Petersen

SixTen & Associates  
5252 Balboa Avenue, Suite 807  
San Diego, CA 92117

**Claimant Representative**

Tel: (858) 514-8605

Fax: (858) 514-8645

---

Mr. Arthur Palkowitz  
San Diego Unified School District  
4100 Normal Street, Room 3159  
San Diego, CA 92103-8363

Tel: (619) 725-7565  
Fax: (619) 725-7569

---

Ms. Harmeet Barkschat  
Mandate Resource Services  
5325 Elkhorn Blvd. #307  
Sacramento, CA 95842

Tel: (916) 727-1350  
Fax: (916) 727-1734

---

Mr. Steve Smith  
Mandated Cost Systems, Inc.  
11130 Sun Center Drive, Suite 100  
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

Tel: (916) 669-0888  
Fax: (916) 669-0889

---

Mr. Gerald Shelton  
California Department of Education (E-08)  
Fiscal and Administrative Services Division  
1430 N Street, Suite 2213  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Tel: (916) 445-0554  
Fax: (916) 327-8306

---

Mr. Michael Havey  
State Controller's Office (B-08)  
Division of Accounting & Reporting  
3301 C Street, Suite 500  
Sacramento, CA 95816

Tel: (916) 445-8757  
Fax: (916) 323-4807

---

Mr. William A. Doyle  
San Jose Unified School District  
1153 El Prado Drive  
San Jose, CA 95120

Tel: (408) 997-2500  
Fax: (408) 997-3171

---

Mr. Andy Nichols  
Centration, Inc.  
12150 Tributary Point Drive, Suite 140  
Gold River, CA 95670

Tel: (916) 351-1050  
Fax: (916) 351-1020

---

Mr. Steve Shields  
Shields Consulting Group, Inc.  
1536 36th Street  
Sacramento, CA 95816

Tel: (916) 454-7310  
Fax: (916) 454-7312

---

Ms. Diana Halpenny  
San Juan Unified School District  
3738 Walnut Avenue  
P.O. Box 477  
Carmichael, CA 95609-0477

Tel: (916) 971-7109  
Fax: (916) 971-7704



---

Mr. Paul Minney  
Spector, Middleton, Young & Minney, LLP  
7 Park Center Drive  
Sacramento, CA 95825

Tel: (916) 646-1400  
Fax: (916) 646-1300

---

Ms. Leslie R. Lopez  
Office of the Attorney General (D-08)  
1300 I Street, 17th Floor  
P.O. Box 944255  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Tel: (916) 324-5499  
Fax: (916) 324-8835

---

Ms. Susan Geanacou  
Department of Finance (A-15)  
915 L Street, Suite 1190  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Tel: (916) 445-3274  
Fax: (916) 324-4888

---

Mr. Jim Spano  
State Controller's Office (B-08)  
Division of Audits  
300 Capitol Mall, Suite 518  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Tel: (916) 323-5849  
Fax: (916) 327-0832

# Commission on State Mandates

Original List Date: 5/22/2001  
Last Updated: 1/6/2003  
List Print Date: 03/17/2003  
Claim Number: 00-TC-15  
Issue: Enrollment Fee Waivers

Mailing Information: Final Staff Analysis

## Mailing List

### Related Matter(s)

99-TC-13 Enrollment Fee Collection

### TO ALL PARTIES AND INTERESTED PARTIES:

Each commission mailing list is continuously updated as requests are received to include or remove any party or person on the mailing list. A current mailing list is provided with commission correspondence, and a copy of the current mailing list is available upon request at any time. Except as provided otherwise by commission rule, when a party or interested party files any written material with the commission concerning a claim, it shall simultaneously serve a copy of the written material on the parties and interested parties to the claim identified on the mailing list provided by the commission. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 1181.2.)

---

Mr. Keith Gmeinder  
Department of Finance (A-15)  
915 L Street, 8th Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Tel: (916) 445-8913  
Fax: (916) 327-0225

---

Mr. Jim Spano  
State Controller's Office (B-08)  
Division of Audits  
300 Capitol Mall, Suite 518  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Tel: (916) 323-5849  
Fax: (916) 327-0832

---

Mr. Gerald Shelton  
California Department of Education (E-08)  
Fiscal and Administrative Services Division  
1430 N Street, Suite 2213  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Tel: (916) 445-0554  
Fax: (916) 327-8306

---

Mr. Keith B. Petersen  
SixTen & Associates  
5252 Balboa Avenue, Suite 807  
San Diego, CA 92117

**Claimant Representative**  
Tel: (858) 514-8605  
Fax: (858) 514-8645

---

Ms. Beth Hunter  
Centration, Inc.  
8316 Red Oak Street, Suite 101  
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

Tel: (866) 481-2642  
Fax: (866) 481-5383

---

Mr. Steve Shields  
Shields Consulting Group, Inc.  
1536 36th Street  
Sacramento, CA 95816

Tel: (916) 454-7310

Fax: (916) 454-7312

---

Ms. Sandy Reynolds  
Reynolds Consulting Group, Inc.  
P.O. Box 987  
Sun City, CA 92586

Tel: (909) 672-9964

Fax: (909) 672-9963

---

Mr. Steve Smith  
Mandated Cost Systems, Inc.  
11130 Sun Center Drive, Suite 100  
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

Tel: (916) 669-0888

Fax: (916) 669-0889

---

Mr. Lawrence Serot  
Glendale Community College District  
1500 N. Verdugo Road  
Glendale, CA 91208

**Claimant**

Tel: (818) 240-1000

Fax: (818) 549-9436

---

Dr. Carol Berg  
Education Mandated Cost Network  
1121 L Street, Suite 1060  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Tel: (916) 446-7517

Fax: (916) 446-2011

---

Mr. Michael Havey  
State Controller's Office (B-08)  
Division of Accounting & Reporting  
3301 C Street, Suite 500  
Sacramento, CA 95816

Tel: (916) 445-8757

Fax: (916) 323-4807

---

Ms. Harmeet Barkschat  
Mandate Resource Services  
5325 Elkhorn Blvd. #307  
Sacramento, CA 95842

Tel: (916) 727-1350

Fax: (916) 727-1734

---

Mr. Paul Minney  
Spector, Middleton, Young & Minney, LLP  
7 Park Center Drive  
Sacramento, CA 95825

Tel: (916) 646-1400

Fax: (916) 646-1300

---

Ms. Susan Geanacou  
Department of Finance (A-15)  
915 L Street, Suite 1190  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Tel: (916) 445-3274

Fax: (916) 324-4888

