





---

*(Refer to "FTES Analysis" handout)*

John reviewed the FTES Analysis with the following highlights:

John noted that the FY2017-18 FTES goal was 19,572, and compared that to P-1, P-2, and annual reports to the state (January, April, and July). He stated that the variance shows the target FTES number vs. the actual FTES, and that LBCC was 656.96 FTES below the target goal. He added that LBCC reported approximately 2,000 fewer FTES in FY2017-18 than FY2016-17, and that in the old formula, the state would provide stabilization funding in the first year of decline (2017-18). He observed that FTES was almost 100 percent of the old funding formula, but would still account for 70% (60% in three years when the SCFF is fully implemented).

---

*(Refer to "Apportionment Calculation" handout)*

John presented the Apportionment Calculation, with the following highlights.

He noted that the calculation reflects LBCC's "hold harmless" status for the



fund STRS/PERS and step-and-column increases. Sara asked for clarification regarding employee and employer contributions to STRS and PERS. Marlene responded that the employee contribution rate was not projected to increase, even though it was insufficient to fund a lifetime of guaranteed benefits, regardless of how well funds were invested. As a result, the employer contribution paid by the District was over and above what might be considered a reasonable share. Chris commented that continued benefits funding was important to ensure that retirees received their promised amounts, and Sara observed that the benefits increases incurred by the District would impact employees personally because the overall budget would not be available for otherBT/F2 12 Tf1 0 0 1 135.98 598.06 Tm0 g0 G 0.06 Tc(be)JTJET 0 1 5-i.14 Tm0 g0 G(otex6(o))-6(