

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY BOARD AGENDA LETTER



Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
105 E. Anapamu Street, Suite 407
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
(805) 568-2240

Agenda Number:
Prepared on: 8/8/02
Department Name: County Administrator
Department No.: 012
Agenda Date: 8/20/02
Placement: Departmental
Estimate Time: 45 mins.
Continued Item: NO
If Yes, date from:

TO: Board of Supervisors

FROM: Michael F. Brown
County Administrator

STAFF CONTACT: James Laponis, Deputy County Administrator, 568-3400
Benjamin Goldstein, 884-8050

SUBJECT: Joint Board of Supervisors' and County Redevelopment Agency's Response to the 2001-2002 Grand Jury Report "Isla Vista - Who's In Charge"

Recommendations:

That the Board of Supervisors and County Redevelopment Agency:

1. Adopt staff's proposed responses as the joint Board of Supervisors and County Redevelopment Agency's response to the 2001-2002 Grand Jury Report, "Isla Vista – Who's In Charge." (Attachment A)
2. Accept the Isla Redevelopment Project Area Committee's review comments as contained in Attachment B.

Alignment with Board Strategic Plan:

The recommendations are primarily aligned with Goal No. 1. An Efficient Government Able to Respond Effectively to the Needs of the Community, and Goal No. 5.A High Quality of Life for All Residents.

Executive Summary and Discussion:

The Grand Jury Report contains 23 findings and 18 recommendations and was released on June 7, 2002. In accordance with Section 933(b), the governing body of the agency (Board of Supervisors) must respond within 90 days after issuance of the Grand Jury Report. Consequently, the Board of Supervisors' response must be finalized and transmitted to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court no later than Thursday, September 5, 2002.

The Report requires responses from three County departments (Planning and Development, Public Works, and Sheriff-Coroner) as well as the Board of Supervisors and County Redevelopment Agency. The department's responses have been sent to the Presiding Judge and are provided as Attachments C, D, and E.

Mandates and Service Levels:

California Penal Code Section 933(c) requires that comments to Grand Jury Findings and Recommendations be made in writing. These comments, in themselves, do not change existing programs or service levels

Fiscal and Facilities Impacts:

None from the recommended action.

Special Instructions:

The response of the Board of Supervisors must be transmitted to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court no later than September 5, 2002. Please return the signed letter to Jennie Esquer, County Administrator's Office, for distribution to the Superior court. The signed letter, written responses, and a 3.5" computer disc with the response in a Microsoft Word file must be forwarded to the Grand Jury

Attachments:

- Attachment A - Board of Supervisor's and Redevelopment Agency's Response
- Attachment B - Isla Redevelopment Project Area Committee's Review Comments
- Attachment C - Planning & Development Response
- Attachment D - Public Works Response
- Attachment E - Sheriff's Department Response
- Attachment F - Copy of Grand Jury 2001-2002 Report

cc: John Patton, Director of Planning & Development
Phil Demery, Director of Public Works
James Thomas, Sheriff-Coroner

August 20, 2002

The Honorable Rodney S. Melville, Presiding Judge
Santa Barbara County Superior Court
312-C East Cook Street
Santa Maria, CA 93456-5369

Mary Anne Harrison
2001/02 Grand Jury Foreperson
1100 Anacapa Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

**Board of Supervisors' and Redevelopment Agency's Joint Response to the 2001-02 Grand
Jury Report on:
"Isla Vista – Who's in Charge"**

Dear Judge Melville and Grand Jury Members:

During its regular meeting of August 20, 2002, the Board of Supervisors met as both the Board and the County's Redevelopment Agency and adopted the following responses as those of both bodies to the findings and recommendations in the 2001-2002 Grand Jury's report "Isla Vista – Who's in Charge."

Introduction to Board of Supervisors and County Redevelopment Agency Response to the Grand Jury Report: “Isla Vista-Who’s In Charge”

Recognizing that the many of the problems in Isla Vista have persisted since at least 1969, the County of Santa Barbara, the University and the Isla Vista Recreation and Park District (IVRPD) began, in the summer of 1998, to investigate joint strategies to improve the community of Isla Vista. Prior to 1998 each agency had worked separately to identify problems and work on solutions. In January 1999, a larger working group was formed, comprising members from the County Planning and Development Department's Comprehensive Planning Division, the County Administrator's Office, the Third District Supervisor's Office, UCSB's Office of Budget and Planning, and the IVRPD to review the options for addressing overcrowding, residential dwelling quality, adequacy of downtown services, architectural design quality, the UCSB/IV interface, parking, traffic, and other infrastructure issues. The group determined that Isla Vista needed a comprehensive approach to solve its complex problems. In June 1999, the working group suggested that a Master Plan be prepared for Isla Vista, which would be implemented through a variety of means, including an amended Redevelopment Plan. This long-range planning effort was estimated to require over four years of effort, concluding in 2004.

In order to formalize the working group and each agency's commitment to the Master Plan process, a memorandum of understanding (MOU) was signed by the Board of Supervisors, County Redevelopment Agency, UCSB and the IVRPD in July 2000. This MOU clarifies the roles, scope of planning efforts and the resource commitments of the parties in a comprehensive planning effort for Isla Vista.

Since the MOU was approved the parties have made progress toward the completion of the Master Plan. These milestones include:

- Completion of an international design competition to select a consultant to assist with the preparation of the Master Plan. The competition allowed the residents of the community to participate in reviewing and selecting the consultant.
- Election of a project area committee (PAC) that reviews and makes recommendations regarding amendments to the Redevelopment Plan. This committee was also appointed as a general plan advisory committee (GPAC) to provide input on the Master Plan.
- Kick-off of the Master Plan preparation with an eight-day design workshop. The workshop was open to the public and was focussed on identifying the problems in Isla Vista and the initial development of solutions.
- Publication of the findings and recommendations of the design workshop.

While it is understood that the Master Plan will not be a panacea for all physical and social issues in the community, this is the first community improvement effort that has included all of these critical agencies. Working together, the sponsoring agencies believe that a plan can be created that will include real solutions to these issues that have plagued Isla Vista.

Finding 1: *No single agency has been assigned the responsibility to address Isla Vista problems incrementally or collectively beyond the planning process.*

Agree. No single entity has the breadth of responsibility and authority to address all problems in Isla Vista. Multiple agencies serving an unincorporated area are not unique. Many local communities in California have multiple governmental agencies established to provide services in this manner and various overlapping agencies with different jurisdictions often provide municipal services, even in incorporated areas. In fact, the unincorporated communities of Montecito, Goleta, Orcutt and Isla Vista share this similar trait. The County, the University and the IVRPD have formed a collective working group that is addressing issues of planning and implementation of policies and programs in Isla Vista.

Finding 2: *The Isla Vista Redevelopment District does not have full time employees or an assigned staff.*

Disagree partially. Agree that the Redevelopment Agency does not employ staff directly, but instead contracts with the County (Planning and Development specifically). Prior to the incorporation of Goleta, the Redevelopment Agency was contracting with the County for five full-time positions responsible for working within the county's two redevelopment project areas. This included one Supervising Planner position, two Planner III positions, and two Planner I-II positions. Disagree that the Redevelopment Agency (RDA) does not have an assigned staff. With the incorporation of Goleta, the agency will continue to contract with the County to fund one half-time Supervising Planner position, one full-time Planner III position, and one full-time Planner I-II position devoted to the Isla Vista project area. These employees are managed through Planning and Development's Comprehensive Planning Division.

Finding 4: *The County, District and University are jointly planning efforts and resource commitments for a new Master Plan which is to be completed in the next two years.*

Agree. The Master Plan is scheduled for adoption in the fall of 2004.

Finding 5: *In many areas the sidewalks have yet to be constructed, although it was an action item in the 1990 Redevelopment Plan.*

Agree. However, the Public Works department has an active sidewalk construction program in Isla Vista that receives funding from the Department's annual road plan which is approved by the Board of Supervisors. For example, this most recent fiscal year \$200,000 was approved for sidewalk construction activities.

Finding 7: *County documents state that the cost of right-of-way limits the installation of sidewalks. The Jury's interviews indicated that several landlords would donate their right-of-way for sidewalk construction.*

Agree. The cost of right-of-way limits the installation of sidewalks, but there are landlords willing to donate property for sidewalk construction. The 3rd District, Public Works Department,

and General Services Department are working with landowners in Isla Vista who are willing to donate right-of-way for sidewalk construction in the priority locations that have been established as a result of community meetings held by the 3rd District.

The Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution that established compensation in the amount of \$20 per square foot of right-of-way conveyed to the County. This set cost has expedited right-of-way acquisitions and has allowed property owners to benefit from the installation improvements at the County's cost. The value was derived from the fact that in most, if not all cases, the easement areas will be located in setback areas that have relatively fewer practical uses other than for sidewalk improvements.

Finding 8: The Isla Vista Redevelopment District does not have sufficient funds to complete the construction of sidewalks, while at the same time it has funded (\$366,500) the purchase of the El Encanto Apartment Housing site. This site is not within the District's boundary.

Disagree partially. The funding for the El Encanto apartments was provided by the mandated affordable "housing set aside" fund. Pursuant to state law, 20% of redevelopment project area property tax increment funds may only be spent on affordable housing projects within the project area or in an adjacent area that would likely serve those that may work or currently live in the project area.

Agree that the RDA does not have sufficient funds to complete all the sidewalks in the project area and carry out other redevelopment projects. However, the RDA is not the sole source of funding for sidewalks. The County's Public Works Department funds sidewalk construction and has an active sidewalk construction program in Isla Vista.

Finding 9: Most of the streets have streetlights installed on only one side and many of the existing lights exceed the County Department of Public Works standard for spacing. For example, the four blocks on Camino Pescadero, north of Sabado Tarde have only five existing streetlights.

Agree. However, the current standards were adopted for new development in 1987. All development requiring streetlights in Isla Vista occurred prior to 1987. Ordinarily, streetlights are positioned on one side of residential streets as opposed to both sides. In fact, over 50 new streetlights have been placed at specific locations throughout the community as a result of community requests facilitated by the 3rd District office. County revenues collected for streetlights in Isla Vista are used to pay Southern California Edison for energy and maintenance costs of their lights. These revenues are derived from benefit assessments in County Service Area 31.

Finding 10: Some of the existing street lights are rated at 70 watts.

Agree. All residential streets, except at intersections, have a minimum requirement of 70 Watts (5,800 lumens).

Finding 12: *The existing parking demand in Isla Vista exceeds the parking space availability. This problem has been a recognized problem for at least 20 years.*

Agree.

Finding 13: *In 1995, the 3rd District Supervisor stated that the parking problem in Isla Vista "continues to be an unmitigated community disaster."*

Agree. This comment was made by a former 3rd District Supervisor.

Finding 14: *Prior studies, by the County, of the parking problems in Isla Vista recognized that the problems resulted in "heavily congested streets with illegally parked vehicles causing obstructions to emergency vehicles, pedestrians, busses and other motorists and bicycles."*

Agree.

Finding 15: *The Isla Vista Homeowners Association has repeatedly requested that the County undertake a program to facilitate parking for Isla Vista residents.*

Agree.

Finding 16: *Present parking ordinances (quantity of parking spaces required based on the number of bedrooms or studios) cause many of the owners to make building changes without proper permitting.*

Disagree partially. Agree that zoning violations involving illegal building conversions occur in Isla Vista. It is recognized that parking requirements are high for development and conversions in the medium and high-density Student Residential (SR-M and SR-H) zone districts. In these zone districts, each bedroom is required to have an off-street parking place due to the common practice of 2 or 3 students sharing a bedroom. An overall parking plan for Isla Vista will be developed as part of the Master Plan process.

Finding 17: *The Isla Vista Housing Inspection Program was established in April 1998.*

Agree.

Finding 18: *The Inspection Program office is not staffed or equipped for adequate Zoning Inspection in addition to Building Code and Safety inspections.*

Disagree. The current office is adequately staffed to respond to reported zoning violations and violations discovered during building permit inspections. In addition, a Zoning Enforcement officer in the Santa Barbara office is assigned to support enforcement efforts in Isla Vista. Since 1998, a significant number of violations have been abated through proper permitting or de-conversion of unpermittable construction. New construction inspectors are not staffed out of the

Isla Vista office, however, there is a high degree of coordination between the Building and Safety Division and the Zoning Divisions. Due to the reduced number of violations, the 2002-03 budget includes one building inspector to staff the Isla Vista office.

Finding 19: *The Inspection Program office computer does not have a broadband connection to the county's network.*

Agree. Planning and Development is seeking to improve the computer services in the office to better assist the building inspector.

Finding 20: *There is no central organization that works to improve the general living conditions. The Isla Vista Parks and Recreation District is the manager of parks and recreation and the Isla Vista Redevelopment District acts only when the Board of Supervisors convene as the District.*

Disagree partially. As noted in the introduction, in January 1999, a working group was formed, comprising members from the County Planning and Development Department's Comprehensive Planning Division, the County Administrator's Office, the Third District Supervisor's Office, UCSB's Office of Budget and Planning, and the IVRPD to review the options for addressing overcrowding, residential dwelling quality, adequacy of downtown services, architectural design quality, the UCSB/IV interface, parking, traffic, and other infrastructure issues. The group determined that Isla Vista needed a comprehensive approach to solve its complex problems. In June 1999, the working group suggested that a Master Plan be prepared for Isla Vista, which would be implemented through a variety of means, including an amended Redevelopment Plan. A Project Area Committee that includes representatives from tenants, property and business organizations was founded in 2001 to advise on redevelopment policy. This long-range planning effort was estimated to require over four years of effort, concluding in 2004.

Recommendation 1: *The Board of Supervisors should designate an agency, department or individual to have primary responsibility to implement programs and policies that will begin to correct the many problems in Isla Vista.*

The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. The County, including the RDA, is working cooperatively with UCSB and the IVRPD to develop the comprehensive Isla Vista Master Plan.

Recommendation 2: *The named agency, department or individual become the central contact for the University administration in the cooperative improvement of the Isla Vista community.*

The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. The County, including the RDA, is working cooperatively with UCSB and the IVRPD to develop the comprehensive Isla Vista Master Plan.

Recommendation 3: *Create a parking district to develop and enforce parking ordinances.*

The recommendation requires further analysis. One of the key issues that contribute to the overcrowding in Isla Vista is the excess of vehicles. The solution to the parking problem must be comprehensive and include a number of components, including integration with UCSB's parking rules. Creation of a parking district is one of the many ideas that are being considered as part of the Isla Vista Master Plan, scheduled for completion in Fall 2004. Initial concepts involve a parking permit program to reduce commuter parking, improving access to alternative transportation and providing a remote parking facility for students and residents who only occasionally need to use their vehicle. While the Master Plan is not scheduled for completion until 2004, the sponsoring agencies are intending to move forward with proposals for a parking district or authority within one year. All parties, including the Grand Jury, should expect any proposal for parking meter or parking permit programs to be presented to the community before it is implemented.

Recommendation 4: Create incentive plans to encourage multiple unit rental owners to upgrade their properties.

The recommendation requires further analysis. Incentives to encourage landowners to undertake improvements are likely to be a component of the Master Plan. Initial incentive strategies were outlined at the design workshop and will be more fully developed during the Master Plan process which is scheduled for completion in 2004.

Recommendation 5: Install new streetlights in areas that exceed Santa Barbara County Public Works standard spacing. Install these new lights on the side opposite the existing ones to improve the overall lighting.

This recommendation has been partially implemented. The 3rd District, in coordination with the Utilities Division of Public Works and the Edison Company has developed a streetlight upsizing project for Isla Vista that will systematically replace the 5800-lumen lamps with 9500 lumen lamps. The plan was presented at a community meeting held by the 3rd District and the first Phase of that project is complete. As scheduled, the remaining lights will be retrofitted within the year. In addition, over 50 new streetlights have been placed at specific locations throughout the community as a result of community requests facilitated by the 3rd District office. Historically, spacing and location of the lights are determined on the basis of technical and budgetary criteria. The current street lighting program is only intended to fund electricity and maintenance costs of the existing Edison owned infrastructure. Current revenues are insufficient for a substantial amount of new luminaries. Increases to existing revenues for electricity and maintenance would require passage of a Proposition 218 ballot proceeding. However, an attempt to adjust rates by marginal increase failed in 1999.

Recommendation 8: The Isla Vista Redevelopment District should insure that all projects remain in the Redevelopment District.

The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted. The preliminary parking strategy, which is consistent with Grand Jury recommendation 11 (see below), includes the provision of an off-site storage lots for infrequently used cars. RDA funds may be used to

contribute to this project. The policy preference for housing financed in part by the RDA is to site projects within the project area. However, there may be particular housing needs of current IV residents that would be more successfully met outside of IV. Given this potential, the RDA should maintain the same ability any redevelopment agency has to fund affordable housing projects that would likely serve existing project area residents or employees, but may be outside the project area boundaries. For example, the City of Santa Barbara successfully cooperated with the County on the St. Vincent's project at State Route 154 and Calle Real.

Recommendation 9: *Segregate the Isla Vista community parking program revenues for use to acquire additional off-site parking in the immediate vicinity of Isla Vista.*

The recommendation requires further analysis. As noted in response to Grand Jury recommendation 3, the solution to the parking problem must be comprehensive and include a number of components. Initial concepts involve a parking permit program to reduce commuter parking in Isla Vista, improving the convenience of transit service and providing a remote parking facility for students and residents who only occasionally need to use their vehicle. A parking permit program may or may not generate revenue. Any revenues that are generated would be used for addressing Isla Vista parking, transportation and circulations issues. All of these alternatives will be explored as part of the Isla Vista Master Plan process.

Recommendation 10: *Work with the Metropolitan Transit District to develop a shuttle bus system, which would facilitate remote low-cost parking and minimize the need for vehicle use in Isla Vista.*

The recommendation requires further analysis. A shuttle system is being considered for inclusion in the Isla Vista Master Plan, while scheduled for completion in Fall of 2004, this proposal may be implemented sooner as opportunities present themselves. The solution to the parking problem must be comprehensive and include improved access to alternative transportation. The County has been working with the Metropolitan Transit District (MTD) since the mid 1990s on providing a shuttle system that serves the Goleta Valley, including Isla Vista and the University. A proposed shuttle system is included in MTD's 1998 South Coast Transit Plan and the County's Goleta Transportation Improvement Plan that provides service between Isla Vista, the Camino Real Market Place, the Hollister Industrial Corridor, and the Fairview neighborhoods. The timing of this project is dependent on funding availability, particularly for operations. This route is identified as a high priority by MTD. The RDA and Public Works Department will coordinate with the MTD throughout the Master Plan process to maximize access to transit within Isla Vista and to provide access to any future remote parking lot.

Recommendation 11: *The Isla Vista Redevelopment District should develop a plan for a remote low-cost parking facility.*

The recommendation requires further analysis. As noted in response to Grand Jury recommendation 3, the solution to the parking problem must be comprehensive and include a

number of components. A remote parking facility for students and residents who only occasionally need to use their vehicle is being considered as part Isla Vista Master Plan process.

Recommendation 13: *Connect the PC workstation in the Isla Vista office to the County network via a broadband system.*

The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented within six months.

Recommendation 14: *Revise the parking ordinances in relation to the actual availability of existing parking.*

The recommendation requires further analysis. The existing parking requirements on rental and commercial property under the zoning ordinances will be reviewed and revised as appropriate during the Master Plan process. One idea discussed at the design workshop is to allow these types of properties to pay fees in lieu of providing parking on site.

Recommendation 16: *The County needs to work with the University to expedite the revision of the west campus so that Pardall Street becomes a major entrance to the University.*

The recommendation requires further analysis. The term "west campus" generally refers to University property west of Isla Vista. For purposes of responding to this recommendation it is assumed that the Grand Jury is referring to the area of the campus adjacent to Ocean Road. Planning and Development is working closely with the University on their west campus development plans and will help to expedite those improvements where appropriate. The Master Plan will address the University's relationship to Isla Vista, particularly along Ocean Road. Recommendations from the design workshop included major improvements to the Pardall intersection. Whether this will remain a pedestrian and bicycle access or will at some point be open to vehicles will be determined in the Master Plan.

Recommendation 17: *The County should approach the University to consider payment of impact fees as any other large employer or developer.*

The recommendation has been implemented. When the University's Long Range Development Plan was developed in the late 1980s, the County approached the University about payment of impact fees to mitigate off-campus effects on the community. After extensive negotiation, a Cooperative Relations Agreement (CRA) and Mitigation and Implementation Agreement were entered into in 1990 by the City and County of Santa Barbara, the University, Citizens for Goleta Valley, Citizens Planning Association and the Isla Vista Association. These agreements called for mitigation of housing and traffic impacts. The CRA established an affordable housing fund that requires contribution from the University that must be used by the University to develop affordable housing for their staff, faculty and students. The Mitigation Implementation Agreement set out a plan for the University to financially contribute to future roadway improvements in Goleta and mitigate traffic impacts associated with growth on campus.

Page 9

These agreements do not require payment of impact fees on the same basis as any other large employer or developer, but they do provide for meaningful mitigation of some of the effects of University development. In cooperation with the City of Goleta, the County will continue to work with the University to address impacts associated with campus growth during the upcoming LRDP update and the Ellwood/Devereux Plan, particularly housing, traffic and parking, public safety and public schools.

Recommendation 18: *The Redevelopment District should work with the University to develop the Isla Vista area into an equivalent world-class living area of which the students and faculty would be proud.*

The recommendation is being implemented. As discussed in the introduction, the County, including the RDA, the University, and the IVRPD entered into an MOU to formally commit to working together to improve the community of Isla Vista. The Master Plan is scheduled for adoption in Fall 2004. However, there are many short and medium term projects that are being implemented now (sidewalk construction, streetlight upgrades, traffic and circulation improvements). The parties recognize that implementation of the plan is a long-term approach that will require coordinated private and public investment. The RDA will be able to issue bonds for redevelopment projects up to 2010. This funding can be used to leverage private dollars to construct catalyst projects identified in the master and redevelopment plans and create the type of physical improvements and economic stimulus that will generate long standing benefits to the Isla Vista community.

Respectfully Submitted,

Gail Marshall
Chair, Board of Supervisors
Chair, Redevelopment Agency

**COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT**

MEMORANDUM

TO: Gail Marshall, Chair Board of Supervisors
FROM: Isla Vista Redevelopment Project Area Committee
DATE: August 15, 2002
RE: Grand Jury Response

On August 15, 2002 the Isla Vista Redevelopment Project Area Committee prepared and approved the following comments on the Board of Supervisor's and Redevelopment Agency's Joint Response to the 2001-02 Grand Jury Report on: "Isla Vista – Who's in Charge"

Overall Comments:

Overall tone of response misses the point. Isla Vista has long-term problems, and none of the responses indicate how status quo will be changed. Board of Supervisors needs to accept responsibility to implement real change in the future.

Finding 1:

Responsibilities to address Isla Vista problems should be assigned. Response should address issue of long-term governance and services in Isla Vista.

Finding 5:

Response should include schedule and plan to implement sidewalk improvements.

Finding 8:

Response should do more to clarify difference between set-aside and general Redevelopment tax increment revenue. In last sentence of the response, please define "active." Add statement to response that priority should be given to projects within Isla Vista.

Finding 9:

Response should not include excuses – rather response should outline how lighting issue will be addressed, and accept responsibility for the existing lighting problems.

Finding 20:

Working group that was formed in 1999 to address housing and other issues should include private sector representatives.

Recommendation 1:

Change response to “recommendation needs further analysis.” Responsibility to implement programs and polices should be assigned. Response should address issue of long-term governance and services in Isla Vista. PAC disagrees strongly that recommendation is not warranted.

Recommendation 2:

See comment on Recommendation 1.

Recommendation 3:

Response should state that parking meter program, implementation of parking permit program, and designation of responsible agency should be implemented immediately. Early resolution of parking issue is critical to any efforts to redevelop as identified by master plan transportation consultants.

Recommendation 5:

Response should indicate that street lighting is responsibility of County Government. County needs to address street lighting problems in Isla Vista immediately. Funding for street lighting in Isla Vista should be obtained. Lighting has been a problem in Isla Vista over 20 years.

Recommendation 8:

Response should indicate that priority should be given to projects in Isla Vista project area.

Recommendation 9:

Response should be changed to “agree”– any revenue from any implemented parking program should be available for the benefit of Isla Vista.

Recommendation 14:

Cut last two sentences of response. It is unclear what they mean.

Recommendation 16:

The term “major entrance” is confusing. Pardall should be improved as an appropriate entrance for more than 10,000 students onto UCSB per day.

Recommendation 18:

Change response to “recommendation **is being** implemented.” PAC is dissatisfied with rate of implementation of short-term projects.