1. Updates from the State Chancellor's Office and California Community College League Regarding Budget Discussions and Issues for 2010-11 (Attachment 1)

2. 2009-10 SBCC Annual Apportionment Report (CCFS 320) and Implications for 2010-11 (Attachment 2)

3. SBCC Cash Flow Analysis and Implications (Attachment 3)
   3.1 Cash flow 2008-09 - actual
   3.2 Cash flow 2009-10 - actual
   3.3 Cash flow 2010-11 – projection/scenario 1
   3.4 Cash flow 2010-11 – projection/scenario 2

4. Considerations in Preparation of the 2010-11 SBCC Adopted Budget
1. Communications from the State Chancellor’s Office and California Community College League regarding budget discussions and issues for 2010-11

Superintendent/President Serban reported that she was sharing the attachments so that we could see how the Senate and the Assembly are trying to help community colleges. However, what remains to be seen is whether these improvements hold. In reviewing the Senate and Assembly budget actions, the only item that would provide new funding for the System would be the 2.21% for growth. What has been heard informally is that if indeed this funding is approved, the State would pro-rate this money across all districts, because of the workload reduction. This new money would be applied to our base.

The communication from Theresa Tena, Director of Fiscal Policy from the California Community College League, states that they recommend that community colleges prepare for a prolonged budget impasse and ensure that they have cash or borrowable resources to ensure district operations without state funds through at least September, if not longer. Superintendent/President Serban reported that this is part of the reason that we want to be sure that we are fiscally sound and have sufficient reserves to sustain payroll and fixed costs for at least four months.

Superintendent/President Serban noted that the information provided will be posted on the President’s website. Mr. O’Neill asked that the information received from the Chancellor’s office be posted also so that the community can understand what the true situation is not only here, but with the state of California.
2. Assumptions used to develop the 2010-11 tentative budget

Superintendent/President Serban noted that because this document had been reviewed previously, she provided highlights only on the changes made since the last time the document was discussed with the Board.

- Revenue #6: The deficit factor was not built into the 2009-10 budget. There will be a deficit factor for this period; however, it is not known yet what that amount will be. This amount will be built into the Adopted Budget when it is presented in September.
- Expense #1d: The direct cost savings that resulted from the reduction of the non-credit sections for summer 2010 have been built into the budget.
- Expense #1c: If the state budget is passed in September and it looks good, the spring credit course sections will not be reduced as drastically as noted here.
- The other unknown is the changes being made to health benefits as a result of the health care legislation passed at the federal level and now required, allowing the addition of more dependents and also the change in the cutoff age for dependents from 19 to 26. At this point, we do not know the additional cost the college will have to cover as a result of these changes.
- Expenses #10: The CalPERS Board will vote to increase the employer contribution rate. Any increase over the 10.2% already budgeted will need to be built into the adopted budget.
- Transfers #2: The transfer to the Children’s Center Fund will be $271,535 instead of the $300,000 originally estimated.

3. 2010-11 tentative general fund unrestricted budget compared to 2009-10 projected, 2008-09 actual and 2007-08 actual

Leslie Griffin, Controller, reviewed with the committee the general fund unrestricted tentative budget. A request was made to have an explanation list prepared providing the information for the decreases or the increases in the budget. After all was reviewed, it was noted that the College will have at the end of this fiscal period net assets of $22,805,043.

4. 2010-11 Complete tentative budget

Leslie Griffin reported that the tentative budget includes a page for every fund. Ms. Griffin went through each fund with the committee members. Superintendent/President Serban noted that more money will need to be transferred from the general fund to the construction fund to be able to complete the deferred maintenance projects or consider not completing some of the projects. Unfortunately, the estimates originally provided for Measure V were
grossly underestimated, as we have found out with the current projects taking place or completed. In reviewing the bookstore fund, it was noted that our bookstore pays for all of its expenses, they operate at a profit and out of that profit they fund various scholarships and activities.

Dr. Andreea M. Serban
Superintendent/President
July 15, 2010

Dear Andreea,

If you haven't noticed, we've been waiting later and later in the week to give you updates on the budget developments. Unfortunately, no news isn't necessarily good news.

There is little in the way of budget news to report. While the Democratic leaders in both houses have reportedly agreed to a general framework, and separate negotiations appear to be occurring between Senate Democratic and Republican leaders, there doesn't appear to be any conversations involving all leaders, including the governor.

The Democrats' plan reportedly would fund Proposition 98 at $1.8 billion over the governor's level, with most of the resources used to eliminate proposed cuts to K-12 schools. We believe it would also eliminate the proposed negative COLA, as well as the proposed cuts to Part-time Faculty Compensation and Extended Opportunity Programs and Services.

Meanwhile, the budget clock continues to tick, **and our colleges continue to engage in costly borrowing to keep the doors open in absence of state funding. Unfortunately, some of our colleges have already been forced to close their doors this summer as student demand far exceeds available resources.**

We're a long way from a final budget deal, and we still need your advocacy to avoid deeper cuts to our colleges. While we're happy that the governor and legislators have mostly been talking about maintaining investment in our colleges, we can't forget the deep level of cuts to vital student success categorical programs imposed last year and, under any budget plan, likely to continue this year.

Keep up your advocacy and, if you need any assistance or materials, do not hesitate to contact the League's budget advocacy team at budget@ccleague.org.

In an hour, community college leaders will first huddle to discuss the system's budget request for the 2011-12 state budget. While the state is certain to continue to face difficult budget times, it is essential for us to continue to tell the story of the amazing work that community colleges can do—if provided the resources necessary to adequately serve our students.

Sincerely,

Scott Lay  
President and Chief Executive Officer  
Orange Coast College '94
Dear Colleagues:

Last night, the Budget Conference Committee completed its work on the education budget, adopting the recently unveiled Democratic plan in a series of votes. As expected nearly every vote was split along partisan lines.

For the California Community Colleges, the actions were consistent with the details provided in my August 4 budget update:

$126 million for enrollment funding (2.21 percent)

Reject negative COLA ($23 million)

$35 million to backfill one-time federal ARRA funding (directed to categorical programs)

$25 million augmentation for the Economic and Workforce Development program to support workforce training enrollments

Reject Governor's proposed $10 million cut to EOPS

Reject Governor's proposed $10 million cut to Part-Time Faculty Compensation

Reject Governor's proposed $20 million augmentation for SB 70 CTE programs

Reject Senate's proposed language to revise Basic Skills categorical funding formula

Establish Joint Powers Authority (JPA) to accelerate repayment of mandated cost reimbursements.

At last night's hearing, new details were provided in regards to the mandate proposal. Language explaining the mandate reimbursement JPA is attached to this update. This mechanism could help community college districts to access over $380 million in overdue mandate reimbursements, providing a welcome infusion of one-time funds. In addition, the Committee voted to suspend or modify a number of K-12 and CCC mandates. For the colleges, the Committee voted to suspend two mandates: Law Enforcement Jurisdiction Agreements and Integrated Waste Management (recycling). If these mandate suspensions are enacted into law, the effect would be to free colleges from the related programmatic requirements for one year and also to free the state of any obligation to cover related costs incurred during that same period.

With the Conference Committee closing out its actions, the stage is set for the next steps in this year's budget battle. While we anticipate that these steps will include floor votes on the Democratic plan as well as Big 5 meetings among legislative leaders and the Governor, no specific timeframes have been announced at this time. More updates to follow.

Regards,

Erik Skinner
Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Policy
California Community Colleges,
Chancellor's Office
Dear Colleagues:

Yesterday, Senate leader Darrell Steinberg and Assembly leader John Perez announced a unified Democratic budget proposal that reconciles the differences between the two house versions. The new budget proposal rejects many of the Governor's most severe proposed cuts to health, welfare, and education programs using additional tax revenues generated through a tax swap proposal. The tax swap proposal would raise Personal Income Tax (PIT) rates for most Californians as well as the Vehicle Licensing Fee (VLF) while at the same time reducing the State Sales Tax. Because the PIT and VLF are deductible from federal income taxes while sales taxes are not, this proposal would provide Californians with increased relief from federal taxes. As a result, this tax swap proposal generates additional tax revenues while not increasing the overall tax burden on Californians. The additional revenues are estimated at $1.8 billion in 2010-11 growing to $3 billion annually by 2012-13. In addition, the Democratic plan would delay implementation of various tax breaks currently set to take effect in 2010-11 ($2 billion in revenue) and imposes an oil severance tax ($1.2 billion in revenue).

In regards to education, the Democratic plan would provide approximately $3.4 billion more in Proposition 98 funding than is proposed by the Governor. These funds would largely be used to reject proposed cuts to K-12 general purpose funds ($1.5 billion), child care programs ($1.4 billion), and Class-Size Reduction ($250 million). While providing more resources for K-12 schools and colleges, the Democratic proposal would also suspend Proposition 98. We have been told that suspension, always a politically charged topic, is proposed in order resolve legal disputes regarding how the Proposed 98 guarantee should be implemented this year given a number of unusual technical complexities that currently exist.

For the California Community Colleges, the details are as follows:

$126 million for enrollment funding (2.21 percent)

Reject negative COLA ($23 million)

$35 million to backfill one-time federal ARRA funding (directed to categorical programs)

$25 million augmentation for the Economic and Workforce Development program to support workforce training enrollments

Reject Governor's proposed $10 million cut to EOPS

Reject Governor's proposed $10 million cut to Part-Time Faculty Compensation

Reject Governor's proposed $20 million augmentation for SB 70 CTE programs

Reject Senate's proposed language to revise Basic Skills categorical funding formula

Establish Joint Powers Authority to accelerate repayment of mandated cost reimbursements. More details are forthcoming, but it appears that this proposal would enable K-12 and CCC districts to borrow against the future stream of mandate reimbursements from the state. At this time the state owes colleges over $380 million for mandate reimbursements.
Upon its release, the Democratic plan was met with immediate criticism from legislative Republican leaders and the Governor's Office who labeled the tax swap plan a tax increase and called the proposal "dead on arrival." Time will tell whether this new proposal provides any fodder for more productive budget negotiations. For the moment, all that is clear is that the Democrats have aligned behind one proposal. While that in itself is a step forward, the general sentiment in the Capitol is that we are still a long way off from a budget deal. More updates will follow as the situation develops.

Regards,

Erik Skinner

Executive Vice Chancellor for Programs

California Community Colleges,

Chancellor's Office
Santa Barbara Community College District
Board of Trustees Fiscal Committee
August 9, 2010

California Resident Full-time Equivalent Students (FTES) Reported on July 15, 2010 (Annual Apportionment Report CCFS 320) and Implications for SBCC 2009-10 and 2010-11 Funding

- Beginning with summer 2008, the College experienced an unprecedented demand for the courses it offers and an all-time high enrollment. This has been the effect of the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression that the State of California and the nation have been experiencing over the last two years. In addition, the severe budget cuts experienced by the three public higher education sectors in California (University of California - UC, California State University - CSU and Community Colleges - CC) have led to significant reductions in course offerings and enrollments at UC and CSU campuses and, as a result, many students who would have attended these universities have sought community colleges instead. Furthermore, neighboring community colleges have made much more severe reductions in their course offerings and sessions than SBCC. Cuesta College, for example, has eliminated almost entirely its summer 2010 credit session with the exception of courses in Allied Health. As a result, even more students have come to SBCC.

- In 2008-09, the College was funded for 2.32% enrollment growth. Growth funding is for growth in California resident FTES. If growth funding is approved through the Legislature and the Governor, the State sets an overall amount of growth funding for the entire Community College System. Individual community college districts have individual allowable growth rates established by the State and based on a number of factors. However, even if growth funding is in the budget, community college districts may not have their entire growth funded if the overall amount budgeted for the entire system is not sufficient. In 2008-09, the College met very closely its funded enrollment level. This was the first in four consecutive fiscal years when the College was able to meet closely its funded enrollment level without needing to use FTES from the second summer term.

- Due to the State budget cuts that the Community College System received, in September 2009, the State Chancellor’s Office informed all colleges that not only there would be no growth funded for 2009-10 but that there is a workload reduction in effect starting with fiscal year 2009-10, although the fiscal year had already started. By the time SBCC was informed about this reduction, the summer 2009 session for both credit and non-credit had already ended and the fall 2009 terms for both credit and non-credit had already begun.

- For SBCC, the funding cuts imposed by the State of California resulted in one-time and ongoing reductions in the general fund budget of $4.2 million in 2008-09, plus an additional $5 million in 2009-10. These reductions have affected every level of SBCC. Of the amount reduced by the State in 2009-10, $2.6 million was a permanent reduction in the College’s base funding, which resulted in what is known
as the workload reduction requirement. This means that the College needs to cut its full-time equivalent students (FTES) by a number equivalent to the $2.6 million cut in SBCC's base apportionment funding. The reduction is from the level of enrollment funded in 2008-09 which represents the apportionment base for 2008-09. That is, to be fully funded for enrollment, in 2009-10, the College should have enrolled 13,220.80 CA resident credit FTES and 2,198.96 non-credit FTES (of which 935.89 enhanced FTES and 1,263.07 non-enhanced FTES) (see the 2009-10 Target row in table below). Non-resident credit enrollment is not funded by the State and the College does not receive reimbursement for this enrollment. The actual enrollments in 2009-10 far exceed the funded levels, as noted below.

- The rate of reimbursement per FTES from the State is as follows:
  - CA resident credit $4,564.83
  - Enhanced non-credit $3,232.07
  - Non-enhanced non-credit $2,744.96

- To achieve the workload reduction in 2009-10, SBCC should have reduced 377 CA resident credit FTES and 300 non-enhanced non-credit FTES compared to its 2008-09 base. However, such a significant reduction in one year would have had a very negative effect on students, particularly for basic skills students and students seeking to obtain a degree, certificate or transfer. The State Chancellor's Office communicated with all community colleges the State priorities in terms of preservation and prioritization of course offerings. On January 22, 2010, Dr. Barry A. Russell, Vice-Chancellor of Academic Affairs (California Community Colleges System Office), stated that the 2009-10 Budget Act language did direct community colleges to "the greatest extent possible, shall implement any necessary workload reductions in areas other than basic skills, workforce training, and transfer." While the Chancellor's did not provide specific directions, they did recommend that each college review their course offerings and evaluate them for three priorities: basic skills, transfer, and career technical education.

- The total CA resident FTES reported for 2009-10 – 16,577.74 – represents an increase of 480.83 FTES (2.98%) compared to the total base for 2008-09 and an increase of 1,157.98 (7.51%) compared to the enrollment level for which the College is funded in 2009-10 (see the 2009-10 Annual FTES Reported row in the table below). This represents $5,209,719 unfunded enrollments. That is, the College provided enrollment opportunities for which it should have received an additional $5,209,719 in State funding but it will not. The College was able to accommodate so much more enrollment than the State funding provides for because: 1) due to effective fiscal management, it has had the financial resources to do so, thus not cutting the large number of classes it would have taken to achieve this drastic decline and 2) some of the faculty allowed more students to enroll in their classes above the published class limit.

- In order to achieve an enrollment level closer to the funding level, the College offered 12% fewer course sections in credit in summer 2010 compared to summer 2009 and a reduced summer 2010 non-credit session. Credit course offerings were also reduced for the fall 2010 semester. However, given the impact these reductions have had on the ability of existing students to fulfill on a timely manner the requirements for degree or transfer, further reductions beyond those already made are not advisable and will be avoided. In addition, the level of reduction in credit classes budgeted for spring 2011 and included in the tentative budget for 2010-11 will not be as high.
### Annual Apportionment Report 2009-10

#### Summary of FTES Reported July 15, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Non-</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Non-</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>Enhanced</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09 Apportionment Base (Funded FTES in 2008-09)</td>
<td>13,598.35</td>
<td>935.89</td>
<td>1,563.07</td>
<td>2,498.96</td>
<td>16,097.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload reduction</td>
<td>-377.55</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-300.00</td>
<td>-300.00</td>
<td>-677.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBCC Growth Rate</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CA RESIDENT FTES ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Non-</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Non-</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>Enhanced</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10 Annual FTES Reported</td>
<td>14,339.76</td>
<td>925.11</td>
<td>1,312.87</td>
<td>2,237.98</td>
<td>16,577.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Difference between Target and Actual

**FTES Difference at Annual - NOT FUNDED BY THE STATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Non-</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Non-</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>Enhanced</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,118.96</td>
<td>-10.78</td>
<td>49.80</td>
<td>39.02</td>
<td>1,157.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Difference</td>
<td>8.46%</td>
<td>-1.15%</td>
<td>3.94%</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
<td>7.51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Difference between 2009-10 annual and 2008-09 base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Non-</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Non-</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>Enhanced</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>741.41</td>
<td>-10.78</td>
<td>-250.20</td>
<td>-260.98</td>
<td>480.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Difference</td>
<td>5.45%</td>
<td>-1.15%</td>
<td>-16.01%</td>
<td>-10.44%</td>
<td>2.98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Allowable growth is 0%; Workload reduction of $2.6 million; Unfunded growth**

| Actual growth | $2,662,780.68 |
| Unfunded growth | $5,209,719.35 |

### Total Reported FTES

**Credit**
- Resident FTES: 14,339.76
- Nonresident FTES: 2,182.90

**Credit Total FTES:** 16,522.66

**Noncredit Total FTES:** 2,237.98

**Total credit and non-credit CA Resident FTES:** 16,577.74

Includes resident and non-resident, credit and non-

**Total SBCC FTES:** 18,760.64 credit
SANTA BARBARA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
GENERAL FUND CASHFLOW

Other Revenue
Consists of:
  International Student Fees
  Nonresident Student Fees
  Student Health Fees
  Donations/Grants
  Parking permits & citations
  Cont Ed Enrollment Fees for Tuition Based Classes
  Sales from Cosmetology
  Sales from School of Culinary Arts
  Course materials fees
  Other revenue items
  Reimbursement from Bookstore & Food Service for payroll

Other Assets
Consists of:
  Accounts Receivable - Student Fees
    "    " State Apportionment
    "    " Lottery
    "    " State Grants
    "    " Foundation for SBCC Grants

  Inventory
  Prepaid Workers Comp Insurance
  Amounts Due from Other Funds (e.g. Bookstore & Food Service reimb for payroll)
  Cash Held in the County Treasury for Bookstore & Trusts

Liabilities
Consists of:
  Accounts Payable to vendors
  Payroll Payable
  International Student Insurance Payable
  Amount Owed to Bookstore & Trusts for cash held in County Treasury
  Unearned Revenue - student fees for Summer & Fall terms
  Amounts Due to Other Funds (e.g. Parking Program transfer to Construction Fund)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2020</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Initial fund allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/2020</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Additional fund allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/2020</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Fee income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/1/2020</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Investment income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/1/2020</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Capital gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1/2020</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Miscellaneous income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/2020</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Grants received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/1/2020</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Revenue from services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/2020</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Revenue from donations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/2020</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Revenue from sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/1/2020</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Revenue from investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1/2020</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Revenue from rentals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2021</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Revenue from membership fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/2021</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Revenue from donations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/2021</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Revenue from services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/1/2021</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Revenue from membership fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/1/2021</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Revenue from rentals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1/2021</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Revenue from investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/2021</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Revenue from donations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/1/2021</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Revenue from services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/2021</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Revenue from membership fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/2021</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Revenue from rentals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/1/2021</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Revenue from investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1/2021</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Revenue from donations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Revenue:** $1,500
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period 1</td>
<td>100000</td>
<td>90000</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 2</td>
<td>150000</td>
<td>120000</td>
<td>30000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 3</td>
<td>200000</td>
<td>180000</td>
<td>20000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation:**
- **Receipts** indicate the income or funds received during the period.
- **Expenditures** represent the costs or funds used during the period.
- **Balance** shows the remaining funds after expenditures are subtracted from receipts for each period.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation (inches)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature (°F)</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2011 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation (inches)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature (°F)</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2012 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation (inches)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature (°F)</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2013 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 |