



# Citizens Bond Oversight Committee Report for July 2014 to December 2015 Solano Community College District

## 1 Introduction

This document is a report by the Citizens Bond Oversight Committee (CBOC) of Solano Community College District (District).

First, the CBOC would like to go on record as saying that we all support a thriving and modern District. One of the greatest needs in our community and the nation is well-trained youth and continued training of adults for the ever-changing opportunities that technology brings to those who are prepared. We are honored to have this chance to participate with helping the District use its funds in the most effective way possible.

This report is composed of the following sections:

2. **Role of the CBOC.** This section describes the role of the CBOC as the CBOC believes it is intended to be.
3. **Activity of the CBOC.** This section summarizes action by the CBOC primarily during the 18 months of this report.
4. **Oversight Opinion.** The CBOC was advised by the Bond attorney that its primary role was to assure that the teachers' salaries and administrative expense were not included in Bond expenditures. Despite many requests to meet with the Bond auditor before and during the bond audit, the CBOC was not allowed to do so.

We have included two Appendices:

- A. **How Bond Measures Work.** This appendix explains the steps from bond issue, tax revenue determination, bond tranches (bond sale units), and projects per tranche. This appendix gives the reader a sense of the realities of bond fund availability, regardless of the size of the bond issue.
- B. **Bond Measures.** This describes the two bond measures, G and Q, the projects executed or begun under each bond measure to date. It does not mention future projects under Measure Q except for the library (in Section 6).



## 2 Role of the CBOC

### 2.1 Guiding Documents and CBOC

There are two guiding documents for the CBOC:

- The Education Code §15278-15282. See A.1 on p. 11 for two other relevant sections.
- The CBOC Bylaws

#### 2.1.1 Education Code

The Education Code indicates that these are the duties of the CBOC.

3.1 Bond Revenue Expenditures. The CBOC shall ensure that bond revenues are expended only for the purposes described in Paragraph (3).

3.2 No Operating Expenditures. The CBOC shall ensure that, as prohibited by Subparagraph (A), no funds are used for any teacher or administrative salaries or other school operating expenses.

3.3 CBOC Activities. In furtherance of its purpose, the CBOC may engage in any of the following activities.

- (1) Performance Audit. Receiving and reviewing copies of the annual, independent performance audit to ensure that the funds have been expended only on the specific projects listed as required by Subparagraph (C). The CBOC will participate with the District in the development of the scope of work for the performance audit and will receive a detailed performance audit report in addition to the published summary report.
- (2) Financial Audit. Receiving and reviewing copies of the annual, independent financial audit of the proceeds from the sale of the bonds until all of those proceeds have been expended for the school facilities projects, required by Subparagraph (D).
- (3) Inspecting School Facilities. Inspecting school facilities and grounds to ensure that bond revenues are expended in compliance with the requirements of Paragraph (3).
- (4) Deferred Maintenance. Receiving and reviewing copies of any deferred maintenance proposals or plans developed by the District.



(5) Cost-Saving Measures. Reviewing efforts by the District to maximize bond revenues by implementing cost-saving measures, including, but not limited to, all of the following:

- a. Professional fees. Mechanisms designed to reduce the costs of professional fees.
- b. Site preparation. Mechanisms designed to reduce the costs of site preparation.
- c. Joint use of core facilities. Recommendation regarding the joint use of core facilities.
- d. Efficiencies in schoolsite design. Mechanisms designed to reduce costs by incorporating efficiencies in schoolsite design.
- e. Reusable facility plans. Recommendations regarding the use of cost-effective and efficient reusable facility plans.

- 3.4 Annual Report. The Committee shall prepare and present to the Board, in public session, an annual written report which shall include the following:
- (1) Compliance Statement. A statement indicating whether the District is in compliance with the requirements of Paragraph (3 and
  - (2) Summary of CBOC Activities. A summary of the CBOC's proceedings and activities for the preceding year.

### 2.1.2 CBOC Bylaws

The initial bylaws provided by the District omitted subsection 3.3 (5) above, measures that might have some prospective impact on bond expenditures. Based a report by the Grand Jury, the CBOC was concerned about this and independently changed its bylaws to match the above provisions of the Ed Code. The CBOC presented our revised bylaws to the District Board which did not accept them and, in fact, revised its version of the CBOC bylaws. The first sentence of the Education Code dealing with citizens bond oversight indicates "...the governing board of the ... community college shall establish and appoint members to an *independent* citizens' oversight committee, pursuant to Section 15282...." [Italics added.] Section 15282 describes the constituencies to be represented on the CBOC. Because this provision clearly indicates that the CBOC is independent, we have continued to consider that our bylaws are controlling, not those provided by the District Board.



Notwithstanding the addition of the five concurrent provisions from Section 3.3 (5) of the ED Code above, these have not been particularly empowering. One or two members of the CBOC have attended some meetings that deal with prospective issues but the CBOC members are all occupied with other professional or public activities and do not have the time to participate more fully in detailed project management activities that would be likely to identify opportunities to combine facility functions to reduce cost. From a practical standpoint, cost saving in one of many facility projects funded by the bond would free up funds for use in another project.

The point of this discussion is to make clear to the reader that the CBOC is an effective vehicle for reviewing material prepared by the project management company and staff and the annual bond financial and performance audits. CBOC retrospective review is not an effective tool for monitoring bond-funded projects to assure that they take advantage of cost-reduction opportunities.

## **2.2 Transition of CBOC Role from that of Prior Years**

### **2.2.1 Transition from Prior Years**

Several members of the CBOC have participated since 2010. Until the last several years, the staff of the District and Kitchell developed the CBOC meeting agendas and Kitchell provided a well-done update on projects, initially for Measure G and, later for Measure Q, as it became the bulk of construction activity. These meetings were attended by the CBOC members but the CBOC members did not effectively contribute to monitoring bond expenditures except for review of the annual bond audit and general observation of the effects of projects. In the last year or so, the CBOC became interested in driving the process. We have prepared our own agendas, reviewed reports from Kitchell prior to attending meetings, asked questions of the Kitchell project manager, and scheduled meetings as we believe appropriate. We have had opportunities to view a number of the construction projects and venues of future construction. We believe that we are on the right path. On the other hand, the CBOC realizes that our only real teeth are the “bully pulpit,” a tool that the CBOC would only use in extremis as it, too, is blunt.

### **2.2.2 Training of the CBOC**

Because of the change in role of the CBOC, it was important that the CBOC receive appropriate training. In June of 2015, an attorney with Dannis Woliver Kelly provided the CBOC with a biased and somewhat inaccurate presentation indicating that the role of the CBOC was unduly limited. Partially in reaction to that, the leadership of the CBOC worked with the Vice President, Finance and Administration, and the Executive Bond Fund Manager to develop a presentation to the CBOC describing how a bond fund is passed and administered. At their personal cost, several members of the CBOC attended a program in Sacramento by CaLBOC, the California League of Bond Oversight Committees. Later, the Interim Executive Bond Fund Manager, Thomas Beckett, provided a talk on the projection of project cost using the Cost Allowance by Unit Cost Guideline.



## 2.3. Grand Jury Reports

In June and July of 2015, the Solano County Grand Jury issued two reports, one dealing with the District Measure Q \$348 million bond and, one dealing with the CBOC.

### 2.3.1 Measure Q Report

The first was entitled “Measure Q: We Have Your Money, Now What?”

[www.solano.courts.ca.gov/materials/Measure%20Q.pdf](http://www.solano.courts.ca.gov/materials/Measure%20Q.pdf) The phrase in the title was taken from a PowerPoint presentation to the District Board on December 5, 2012, which included that phrase (report, p. 5). The point of the report was that a bond issue is supposed to be based on a facility master plan and some of the District plans were fairly general, not at that level. The required specificity of a plan supporting a bond issue has been litigated with respect to other bond issues with differing outcomes. The appearance was that the level of homework done to support the bond issue could have been more exhaustive. Some CBOC members think that the District was allowed some flexibility. Others think this was a lapse.

### 2.3.2 CBOC Functioning

The second report, “Citizens Monitoring Measure Q,” dealt with the failure of the CBOC to act as an independent entity and to act as more of a vigorous force in oversight.

[www.solano.courts.ca.gov/materials/CBOC.pdf](http://www.solano.courts.ca.gov/materials/CBOC.pdf) The report criticized the authorship of the prior Annual Report by Kitchell and not the CBOC. Since that report, the CBOC has implemented a number of recommendations of the Grand Jury.

The following are some of the key activities of the CBOC in the year and a half reporting period.

## 3 Activity of the CBOC

### 3.1 Measure G and Q Bond Audits

Under the Education Code, the first two duties of the CBOC, 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 (1) and (2), are to ensure that bond revenues are used for the purposes of the bond and not for teacher or administrative salaries or college operating expenses. The CBOC is to receive and review the financial and performance audit of the bond funds.

In approximately March of each year, the District’s bond auditing firm Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Co., LLP, compiles the results of the bond audits. The audits have two elements, a financial audit and a performance audit. The financial audit is what one would expect from a financial audit of an organization. The opinion indicates that the financial statements for each bond present fairly in all material respects the position of the audited general obligation bonds in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.



The performance audit, one for each bond fund, is to determine that expenditures charged to the particular bond fund have been made in accordance with the bond project list approved by the voters. The performance audit also determines whether salary transactions charged to the bond fund were in support of the named measure and not for District general administration or operations.

As noted in the Introduction to the report, the CBOC was not allowed to participate as desired in the 2015 audit as we were encouraged to do by the Bond attorney and the District CFO.

### 3.2 Inspecting School Facilities

The CBOC and the District worked together to visit projects before and after construction. These are examples:

- **Fairfield Campus.** Visited many of the projects addressed by Measure G and some addressed by Measure Q. Visited the existing library to understand the desire for a replacement library, dependent upon a California bond issue, in addition to Measure Q funds. Attended the opening of work on the Theatre building.
- **Vacaville Campus.** Visited the new facility shortly after it was opened.
- **Vallejo Campus.** Visited the campus.

### 3.3 Deferred Maintenance

The CBOC is to receive and review copies of deferred maintenance plans developed by the District. The CBOC did not receive any deferred maintenance plans from the District.

### 3.4 Cost Saving Measures

The CBOC is charged with reviewing efforts by the District to maximize bond revenues by implementing cost-saving measures, including, but not limited to, all of the following:

#### 3.4.1 Professional Fees. Mechanisms designed to reduce the costs of professional fees.

The District reported the following activities.

1. Selected a pool of 20 qualified architecture and engineering (A/E) firms/teams (list of firms in the pool available for review); reduction in cost and time for eliminating A/E RFQ for each individual project.
2. Select the most project specific qualified firms to solicit proposals from and choose the firm that has the appropriate past experience and provides the best value for a particular project.
3. Develop detailed scopes of work specific to each project or group of similar projects.
4. When appropriate and feasible, we bundle smaller/similar projects to create efficiencies in architectural design fees.
5. Use standard contracts which include comprehensive scope, services and fees.
6. Treat firms fairly, pay promptly to encourage qualified firms to work for the District.
7. Develop specific scope of work for each project prior to assignment of A/E; communicate scope, schedule and budget clearly in contract.



8. District/stakeholders provide needed information and make design decision in a timely manner; facilitate decision-making. Avoid A/E redesign efforts due to changes in scope or direction by District.

### **3.4.2 Site preparation. Mechanisms designed to reduce the costs of site preparation.**

The District reported the following activities.

1. Use alternative delivery method – such as Design Build.
2. Minimize the size of the site being disturbed.
3. Design site work so that the site is “balanced,” no export or import of soils whenever possible.
4. Ensure site design, landscaping design and foundation design are the most cost effective.
5. Locate buildings to minimize utility runs/costs.
6. Thoroughly investigate site conditions prior to design phase; for example, geotechnical study/borings, hazmat testing, documentation of existing underground utilities.

### **3.4.3 Joint use of core facilities. Recommendations regarding the joint use of core facilities.**

The District reported the following activities.

1. Physical Education Facilities – Fields, Gym, Pool, etc.
  - a. General – Plan for and modify/renovate/design facilities to foster and facilitate multiple uses and users.
  - b. Rent facilities to groups and teams for practice, games and tournament
  - c. Co-sponsor tournaments
  - d. Provide venue for local/regional/state championships
  - e. Have student services facilities available for event spaces (food services, restrooms, lounge, etc.) available to tournament attendees
  - f. Facilitate Food Court (utilizing food trucks) for events versus method suggested in iv above.
  - g. Provide tent area with seating for dining and casual gathering during events.
2. Horticulture – Joint Master Gardener Program, botany, earth science program with Farm Bureau, 4H, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, and other similar groups.
3. Middle College – all local high schools: Distance learning
  - a. Set up more classrooms for distance learning.
  - b. Offer broader selection of courses on line.
4. Partner with UC and/or CSU to offer “extension” classes and certification programs at all District locations with the potential of offering full BA and BS degrees through those institutions.
5. Vacaville Fire Training
  - a. Joint use of facilities
  - b. Training Programs
6. Aeronautics Partnership
  - a. Joint use of facilities
  - b. Training Programs



7. Vallejo Automotive Technology – Referee Facility Partnership

#### **3.4.4 Efficiencies in schoolsite design. Mechanisms designed to reduce costs by incorporating efficiencies in schoolsite design.**

1. Update and maintain campus/center educational and facility master plans.
2. Inventory all existing “As-Built” drawings into an electronic database so they are easily searched and accessed.
3. Validate and confirm all existing site utilities for each specific project to minimize unforeseen conditions during construction.
4. All major new capital projects to be designed to LEED Silver criteria.
5. All major renovation projects to be designed to LEED Certified criteria.
6. Reduce energy consumption and overall energy cost.

#### **3.4.5 Reusable facility plans. Recommendations regarding the use of cost-effective and efficient reusable facility plans.**

1. Consideration will be given to developing a ‘prototype’ classroom building, in anticipation of potential use in multiple site locations. The building plans would then be site adapted to each location (soils and site conditions), with potential minimal revisions to the interior configuration. This could reduce the A/E fees and plan development schedule associated with the subsequent buildings.

## **4 Oversight Opinion**

In this section, we of the CBOC discuss our findings and provide our oversight opinion.

### **4.1 Support of Solano Community College**

As indicated in the Summary, all of the members of the CBOC serve without reimbursement, putting in significant time and effort. We do this because we support Solano Community College and wish it to make the best possible use of bond funds.

### **4.2 Intentions of District Staff and Board**

Most of the CBOC members believe that the District staff and Board are well-meaning and conscientious. The prior instance of the CBOC was an entity that simply observed the information that the District provided to the CBOC which limited the ability of the CBOC to make a contribution. As the CBOC has attempted to be more relevant, we have met with some resistance.

### **4.3 Specific Contentions with the District**

The CBOC has had a number of disappointments with the transparency of the District as enumerated below. Now that the Superintendent of the District has changed from an interim person, we trust that the situation will improve.





### 4.3.1 CBOC Bylaws

As noted earlier, the CBOC drafted its own bylaws quoting generously from the Ed Code. We presented our bylaws to the District Board which took them under advisement and returned the next meeting with a different version of bylaws. Given that we believe the CBOC is an independent entity, we did not accept the District Board's bylaws and they did not accept ours. Our position is that the bylaws of the CBOC govern.

### 4.3.2 Audit Role of CBOC

In the discussions of the role of the CBOC, we were repeatedly informed by the District that our principal role was to be involved with the financial and performance audits. The CBOC formed an Audit Subcommittee in the fall of 2015 and asked that we be involved in the audit. We were told that we would be invited to meet with the auditor before the beginning of the audit. Despite numerous requests to the District to schedule a meeting, the timing was repeatedly delayed by weeks or months "because the auditor was not ready." In the end, the audit was published on March 10, 2016, and the CBOC Audit Subcommittee had never met with the auditor, before, during or after the audit. The CBOC did not see the audit until it was presented to us as a bound document – the deed and not the act.

### 4.3.3 Expenditure Concerns

The CBOC has limited ability to understand financial activities proactively since all powers are retrospective. Thus, it is difficult for us to identify expenditures that we deem to be unnecessary or not advisable. We did identify several concerns.

1. **Temporary space for the theater.** While the work was being done on the Fairfield campus theater, the District spent \$1.2 million on temporary changes to 360 Campus Lane to accommodate the theater during the renovations. We asked why this was done instead of renting one of the other theaters in the area. We were told that the faculty was unwilling to drive to an off-campus location. To us, the great theatre renovations and potentially avoiding \$1.2 million in cost less rental cost for a convenient interim venue were worthy of some temporary inconvenience and an alternative should have been more thoroughly considered.
2. **Leed Certification.** Several of the new and renovated buildings will have Leed certification. (Leed-certified buildings are resource efficient. They use less water and energy and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.) When a CBOC member initially asked about this, he was told that the certification cost \$50,000 per building. Later, when the suggestion had been made by CBOC to document achievement of Leed level of performance without the certification, the CBOC was told that there was no cost for Leed certification. The US Green Building Council shows significant fees for Leed certification at <http://www.usgbc.org/cert-guide/fees>. The District should build to Leed standards and be energy efficient but not pay for a "certification" that primarily benefits the reputation of the architect and builder. The CBOC found that in many jurisdictions, building insurance is lower for a Leed certified building, with a three-year payback. Thus Leed certification seems to make sense.



3. **Library project.** The District has a large library with a great deal of volume (high ceilings). The décor and furnishings are dated and not particularly functional. The plan of the District is to pair \$21.8 million of the Measure Q bond funds for refurbishing the library with \$19.6 million from a California bond measure anticipated on an upcoming ballot and use the combined funds to replace the library. One can make the case that a \$40 million library would be a nice addition to the campus, but a \$21 million renovation should be able to make the current facility workable. The CBOC would like to see an unbiased study comparing the more expensive approach against the potential of renovation of the existing facility. The CBOC believes that the District should manage the bond resources so that the funds go as far as possible, not spend funds on a project which may not be necessary. The next approved bond issue may be very far away.
4. **Deferred maintenance program.** The CBOC did not have the opportunity to review a deferred maintenance plan. The concern is that funds for maintenance of a facility will not be expended and that at some point, the facility will be deemed lost and in need of replacement.
5. **Aeronautics program.** An aeronautics program was not listed in the potential uses of the Measure Q bond funds. The bond fund did include the phrase “included but not limited to” which makes it difficult for the CBOC or any legal or judicial body to determine what the Measure Q bond fund includes. According to the *Nut Tree Airport Business Plan* dated September 2015 <https://admin.solanocounty.com:4433/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=21666> , Solano Community College has used Measure Q funds to purchase 5.45 acres within the Nut Tree complex for possible development of an Aeronautics Center and expansion of the aeronautics curriculum. “The preliminary SCC Aeronautical Center building would be approximately 40,000 square feet on two levels.”(p. 56). This is a large commitment to aeronautics. We asked the District for its plan for the Aeronautics Center and were told that it had not yet produced one, even though it has purchased the land. The CBOC has asked the District for further information on the aeronautics program and will review that after submission of this report. Any findings will be included in a subsequent report.

#### 4.4 CBOC Compliance Statement

With the exceptions noted above, the staff of the District have been courteous, helpful and supportive of the role of the CBOC. We would hope that the bond financial and performance audits were done responsibly but because we were denied participation in that process, we cannot say that the Measure G and Measure Q bond fund monies have been used in accordance with the intent of the bond issues. Further, we cannot say that funds have not been used for prohibited purposes such as supporting teachers or administrative staff performing functions unrelated to the bond issues. We can say that the auditor in the audit reports attests to both of the above.



## Appendix A

### How Bond Measures Work

#### A.1 Proposition 39: Voter approval of a facility bond measure changed from 2/3 to 55%

Prior to the year 2000, a school facilities bond measure required a 2/3 majority to be enacted. On the November 7, 2000, ballot, Proposition 39, an initiative-based constitutional amendment, changed the Education Code to reduce the threshold for voter approval of a school facilities bond measure to 55% if the bond measure includes a citizens' oversight committee. In the legislative session, 1999-2000, the Senate Committee on Education chaired by Dede Alpert took a proposed bill for another purpose and "gutted it," replacing the content by the functions of a citizens' oversight committee. The provision enacting the citizens' oversight committee is in the Education Code, Title 1, Division 1, Part 10, Chapter 1.5, Article 2. Citizens' Oversight Committee, §15278-15282 and §15284-15288. Ed Code §15264-15276 deals with the ability of an educational facility to seek a bond issue.

#### A.2 Available Bond Funds

The amount of funds requested for a bond issue is based on a master facilities plan which indicates what facilities are needed or need to be replaced and the priorities. There are limitations specified in Ed Code §15268-15270 as to the amount of a single facilities bond issue for elementary, high school and community colleges, both for an individual bond issue and the aggregate of bond issues. Once the bond issue is passed, the amount of funds from the bond issue becomes available in segments called tranches, based on the anticipated income from taxation of county residents at the tax rate of the bond issue. For example, for Solano Community College District, the funds are envisioned as being available in three tranches. Because the funds become available in tranches, projects are staged to be completed in one of the three tranches, depending on the District judgement of the priority of each project and the amount of funds needed for each.

#### A2.3 Project Estimation

One might think that the amount of funds for each project would be subject to discussion between the facilities project staff, the Board of the District and the CBOC. In fact, the standard operating procedure for an educational facility project is to use a standard for cost estimation based on criteria that the educational facility provides. The construction cost guidelines are provided as a list of room codes with a default price per square foot (not a range). The result is that once the facility needs have been dictated by the educational institution, the cost has been estimated. While each project is bid individually or in a group, the estimated cost has been produced in advance and whenever any building comes in below the cost estimate, the surplus is allocated to other projects as if it were "uncommitted" money. The point to be made here is that while the CBOC can, in theory, suggest actions to conserve funds, from a practical standpoint, when the bond measure is approved, the process going forward limits the ability of the CBOC to influence expenditures. See Section B below on the Role of the CBOC. There are periodic change orders which are typically justified to the District Board and the Board on



occasion has pushed back as to the reason for the change order. The CBOC is not given advance notice of change orders except in the board package which is available, in part, a few days in advance of the board meeting. The CBOC has the same right to speak at a board meeting as a member of the public, 3 minutes. What this means is that the CBOC cannot be well-informed about change orders and thus cannot speak intelligently about them as notice is short and the time to speak is limited.

#### **A.4 Project Management**

The District utilizes Kitchell as its bond management consultant and Kitchell staff appear to do an excellent job. The Kitchell manager has always been able to answer technical and funding questions immediately or provide detailed follow-up information.



## **Appendix B**

### **Bond Measures**

#### **B.1 Measure G**

Measure G was approved by voters in 2002. Measure G allowed the Solano Community College District to invest \$150 million, including the initial \$124.5 million bond plus interest and additional funding sources, in a variety of construction projects. These projects include: the construction of “Centers” at the Vacaville and Vallejo campuses; the construction of a Student Services Building on the Fairfield campus; and the acquisition of new equipment and modernization of other buildings. The renovation of the Administration Building on the Fairfield campus was the last major project to be completed under Measure G. The lists of projects in this Appendix are taken from Kitchell Quarterly Progress Updates, with some aggregation of similar projects.

(Continued on next page)



**Table B.1. Measure G Bond Issue Projects**

Project Name	Measure G Funding & Expenditure as of 6/30/2015	Percent Spent
<b>Fairfield Campus</b>		
Student Services Center (Bldg 400)	\$ 15,457,496	
Renovation/Equipment (Bldgs: 1700, 1400, 1800, 300, 500, 1500, 1200, 1000, 1600, 1900. 600)	42,110,993	
Building 700 & 800 Annex	8,350,623	100%
Building 1400 Modernization & Kitchen Replacement	6,985,498	100%
Police and Public Services	59,683	100%
Utility Infrastructure (Hydronics)	5,911,348	100%
Sports Complex	5,435,697	100%
Library (Interim Remodel) (Bldg 100)	2,133,136	100%
College Infrastructure	561,160	100%
ADA Phase I & II	407,979	100%
Fine Arts Equipment (Bldg 1300)	173,838	100%
Building 200 & CTE Labs	170,611	100%
Nut Tree	268,842	100%
Campus-wide Exterior Painting	91,161	100%
Stadium Renovation/Track (Bldg 2112)	69,670	100%
Campus-wide Signage In-House Study	18,383	100%
Kitchen Upgrade (Bldg 202, 200)	238,821	100%
Security Systems Upgrade	241,416	100%
Campuswide Landscape	60,736	100%
Demolition of Portables	7,311	100%
<b>Vacaville Campus</b>		
Vacaville Center	20,450,873	100%
Vacaville Parking Lot Expansion	1,575,435	100%
<b>Vallejo Campus</b>		
Vallejo Center	23,894,821	100%
Vallejo Parking Lot Expansion	1,260,015	100%
<b>Districtwide</b>		
Campuswide Technology Upgrade	3,227,509	100%
Overall Program Costs/Measure G General	11,203,059	98%
Small Capital Projects (Classroom Upgrades)	550,729	68%
<b>Program Reserve</b>		
Program Reserve	246,825	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 151,163,668</b>	<b>100%</b>



## B.2 Measure Q

Measure Q, the Solano Community College District Student/Veterans' Affordable Education, Job Training, Classroom Repair Measure, is a \$348 million authorization of bonds that was approved by voters in 2012. The proceeds from these bonds are to be used to expand access to affordable education; meet earthquake and fire safety codes; upgrade employer job placement facilities; upgrade engineering, welding, nursing, and firefighter training centers; and acquire, construct and repair facilities, sites and equipment. The following projects are among those funded thus far through Measure Q: renovation of the Performing Arts Building, design of the Science Building, and design of structures for Horticulture on the Fairfield campus; design of a Biotechnology and Science Building, purchase and renovation of a classroom building, and site acquisition and design of an Aeronautics and Workforce Development Building on the Vacaville campus; and site acquisition and design of an Autotechnology Building on the Vallejo campus. The table below indicates the active projects in 2015.

**Table B.2. Measure Q Bond Issue Projects**

Project Name	Measure Q Project Budget	Other Funding	Measure Q Expenditures as of 12/31/2015	Percent Spent as of Feb 3, 2016
<b>Fairfield Campus</b>				
Performing Arts Building (Phase 1 Renovaton)	\$ 6,200,000	\$ 13,760,630	\$ 870,798	12.7%
Performing Arts Building (Phase 2)			33,151	
Science Building (Phase 1)	33,100,000		358,210	1.1%
Agriculture (Horticulture)	2,000,000		56,201	2.8%
<b>Vacaville Campus</b>				
Classroom Building Purchase & Renovation	8,200,000		3,301,160	40.3%
Biotechnology & Science Building	28,000,000	6,500,000	2,988,747	8.7%
Aeronautics & Workforce Development	15,000,000		988,942	
<b>Vallejo Campus</b>				
Property purchase Belvedere	4,800,000		4,794,343	99.9%
Property purchase Northgate	6,800,000	100,000	6,871,471	99.6%
Autotechnology Building	19,600,000	5,200,000	3,778,702	15.2%
<b>Infrastructure Improvements</b>				
IT Infrastructure Improvements	14,000,000		2,711,550	19.4%
Utility Infrastructure Upgrade (Energy)	23,800,000	494,578	9,858,994	43.5%
<b>ADA &amp; Classroom Improvements</b>				
Small Capital Projects	8,300,000		652,000	7.9%
<b>Planning, Assessments &amp; Program Mgt</b>				
Program Management, District Support & Planning	25,400,000		8,326,867	32.8%
<b>Reserve &amp; Interest</b>				
Program Reseve & Interest	17,400,000	(3,100,000)	0	0%
<b>SUBTOTAL PROJECTS ACTIVE</b>	<b>\$ 212,600,000</b>		<b>\$ 45,591,136</b>	<b>21.4%</b>
<b>TOTAL BOND SPENDING PLAN</b>	<b>\$ 348,000,000</b>			