



Citizens Bond Oversight Committee

For Solano Community College District
Measures G and Q Bonds

Special Meeting Minutes: Workshop

Tuesday, March 15, 2016
3:30p.m. – 5:00p.m.

Fairfield Campus Building 600, Board Room
Solano Community College, 4000 Suisun Valley Road, Fairfield, CA 94534

1. CALL TO ORDER

A Special Meeting of the Solano Community College District Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee was called to order at 3:30 p.m., on Tuesday, March 15, 2016, by the Chair Lyman Dennis.

2. ROLL CALL

Present

Lyman Dennis, Chair
Hermie Sunga, Vice Chair
Elisha Blue
Angelo Cellini
Robert Charboneau
Neil Ferguson
David Fleming
Ward Stewart

Absent

Andre Stewart

Other Present:

Patrick Killingsworth, Director, Fiscal Services
Laura Convento, Business Operations Coordinator
Tom Beckett, Interim Executive Bonds Manager
Pam Kinzie, Program Manager, Kitchell
Terri Montgomery, Auditor, VTD



3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

4. COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

No comments from the public.

5. APPROVAL OF PAST MINUTES

Corrections to Minutes

November 17

- Fourth line on page 4 should read “ The Board gave no consideration”

October 13, 2015

- Ward Stewart noted that he was a Director of Department that provided Academic Support, not head of the math department, on page 2.

Moved by Mr. Cellini to approve the minutes for July 21, 2015, August 11, 2015, October 13, 2015 and November 17, 2015 with corrections noted, seconded by Mr. Ferguson. The motion carried unanimously.

6. PRESENTATION BY MEASURE Q AUDITOR, Terri Montgomery, VTD

Terri Montgomery from Vavrinek, Trine and Day Co., LLP presented the Financial and Performance audits for Measure G and Measure Q Bonds. She simply stated that the financial audit verifies the accuracy of the numbers and the performance audit’s goal is to verify if funds were spent on the projects approved by the Bond. She reiterated that Measure G and Q were covered and the report does not cover the District Audit.

Both Measure G and Measure Q had clean financial audits, with no findings.

For the Measure Q Performance Audit, the auditors reviewed transactions covering 68% of the total expenditures from July 1, 2014 - June 30, 2015 (Target 25-35%). The audit showed the District properly accounted for the expenditures and bond funds were spent on authorized projects.

For the Measure G Performance Audit, the auditors reviewed transactions covering 65% of the total expenditures from July 1, 2014 - June 30, 2015 (Target 25-35%). The audit showed the



District properly accounted for the expenditures and bond funds were spent on authorized projects.

Ms. Montgomery went over the Board Communications letter noted a difference of \$104k in the Measure Q County fund due to a past audit adjustment not recorded. The auditors deemed this immaterial with no effect on the statements as a whole.

Ms. Montgomery answered questions from the committee.

Mr. Dennis asked about the Tranches. Ms. Montgomery commented that for the bonds, everything that was sold so far has been spent. Ms. Kinzie added that the next tranche sale will be in 2017 for about 70-100 million and discussed the different factors that may impact what is received.

Mr. Beckett commented that the Bond measure was for \$348 million, the first tranche was about \$120 million.

Mr. Charboneau asked Ms. Montgomery to expand on what constitutes “authorized Bond projects.” She responded that they perform a ballot analysis and review the language. She listed the types of expenses the bond could be used for. Mr. Charboneau asked where the Aeronautics projects fits in. Ms. Montgomery added that it falls under aging classrooms and facilities. Mr. Beckett added the land purchased for aeronautics will be use to replace the lease facility.

7. CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATION, Thomas Beckett

Mr. Beckett presented on construction cost estimation. Prior to the meeting he sent construction cost guideline sheets (From FUSION). He reported that these cost guidelines are from the Department of Finance, which is used by the State Chancellor’s office, UC, CSU, state prisons, other state funded entities.

He noted on the handout, room codes are assigned to classify the space. Depending on the type of space, the cost per square foot varies. (\$763 classroom for square foot, \$76 equipment costs per square foot). Construction cost guidelines are discussed here in terms of assignable square feet (asf). Assignable square feet is the space in a building that is usable for teaching purposes.

110-210 on the room codes are lecture and lab space. TOP# stands for the Taxonomy of Programs. Each discipline has its own program code. The information provided basically determines how much funding the school will receive. The state funds the hard costs (construction), soft costs (plans and work drawings) and cost of equipment. The state funds about 75% of the costs for new construction.



Mr. Beckett used the library (building 100) replacement project as an example. Replacement project are considered in-kind (same amount of square footage as the original ~44k sq ft.). The goal of the project is to create a learning resource center, and introduce new technology.

He discussed the costs, anticipated construction schedule, breakdown of square footage by area type. He further explained how costs are allocated based on certain percentages, how hard costs are itemized, allowances by space type, etc.

In 2009, the library/LRC project cost was about \$27 million. He noted the state pays at the midpoint of construction. (Example: For a 24 month project, state would fund at month 12) Due to inflation, passage of time, other impacts to cost of material, the project would cost \$41 million today. Currently, there are no state funds available. In November 2016, there is a state GO (General Obligation) Bond on the ballot. If the Bond passes, the project will get funded. Mr. Beckett noted it's a 50/50 split. If the Bond does not pass, then the District will decide whether to pursue project or wait for another statewide GO bond.

The District can fund the library entirely with Measure Q, but it would be wise to leverage bond funds.

8. TOPICS & OUTLINE FOR CBOC REPORT

Mr. Dennis discussed the overview/outline of the report. He hopes to have a draft completed by the next CBOC meeting in June. He noted a few items that he would like from Kitchell/Bond team. The information can be located on the Bond website. There is no real due date.

Mr. Sunga suggested to summarize the active projects in the report, rather than having a matrix of all projects.

Mr. Cellini noted that the upcoming projects should also be included in the report. Keep the report general.

Mr. Stewart and Mr. Fleming volunteered to help with the report writing. Mr. Charboneau commented that CBOC should include we did, failed to do, what we accomplished as a group.

9. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will be on Tuesday, April 26th, 2016.



10. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Beckett announced that this will be his last meeting. He commented that he came for three months and stayed for seven. He noted that they will be having final interviews for his successor. Mr. Beckett invited the committee to attend the regular District/Kitchell Bond meetings held every Wednesday, from 9-11 am, at 360 Campus lane. A great opportunity to meet the players of the respective Bond projects and hear status updates on the projects.

Mr. Dennis reported that he would like to discuss finding his successor as chair. His term expires February 2017. Term expiration was discussed. He noted that Mr. Charboneau will term out in May.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Mr. Cellini and seconded by Mr. Sunga to adjourn the meeting. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:57 p.m.