



SOLANO COUNTY GRAND JURY
2014 - 2015

**MEASURE Q:
WE HAVE YOUR MONEY, NOW WHAT?**

**MEASURE Q:
WE HAVE YOUR MONEY, NOW WHAT?
2014-2015 Solano County Grand Jury**

I. SUMMARY

On November 6, 2012, Solano County voters were presented with Measure Q, a Proposition 39 bond measure purporting that Solano Community College (SCC) would provide job training, affordable education to veterans, and classroom repair. Unfortunately, bond measures such as this are limited by definition to the purchase and furnishing of physical buildings, repairs to buildings, and land acquisition. Monies may **not** be used to enhance programs, or to add courses, training, or teachers.

As will be demonstrated below, the language of Measure Q was misleading and contradictory, and failed to comply with the California Constitution and other applicable statutes, instead playing on the voter's emotions in effort to obtain **\$348 million** in funding to be paid back over a period of **40 years**.

The casual attitude of some of the college administration coupled with its assumption that voters would positively respond to buzz words like "veterans", "disabled", and "job training" without investigating the bond measure more carefully is highlighted nowhere better than in the ballot pamphlet itself.

Additionally, foundational documents identified as in existence and available in the Solano College President's Office for review by the public did not, in fact, exist.

By approving measure Q the 2014-15 Grand Jury believes voters passed a bond that was not properly presented, and was arguably misleading at best.

II. INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

History of Proposition 39

On November 7, 2000, California voters passed Proposition 39 (The School Facilities Local Vote Act of 2000) as an initiated **constitutional amendment, which also amends portions of the Education Code**. Its primary purpose was to reduce the threshold required to pass a school district bond measure from a two-thirds "supermajority" to 55%. **In exchange** for this reduced pass-rate, Article XIII A of the California Constitution requires school districts to, among other things, comply with the following:

- The ballot measure must contain a list of the **specific** school facilities **projects to be funded**, and certification that the community college board has evaluated safety, class size reduction, and information technology needs in developing that list;
- The community college board must conduct an annual, independent performance audit to ensure funds have been expended only on those **specific projects listed**;
- The community college board must conduct an annual, independent financial audit of the proceeds from the sale of the bonds until all proceeds have been expended.

Also significant to note is that bond measures passed in accordance with Proposition 39 relate to the funding of **buildings**, or the **purchase of land only**. i.e., acquiring, constructing and repairing facilities, sites and equipment. Bond proceeds may not be used to pay teacher or administrator salaries, and more importantly, they **may not be used for programs such as job placement, job training, additional college course opportunities (whether for students seeking a two-year degree, or those planning to transfer to four-year colleges)**.

Emotionally-Charged Language and “Key Words” Were Utilized In Measure Q

Measure Q was brought to the voters in November 2012, and was referred to in the ballot pamphlet as the “Solano Community College District **Student/Veterans’ Affordable Education, Job Training, Classroom Repair Measure**”. (Emphasis ours)

Given the restrictions dictated by Proposition 39, the mere inclusion in the actual formal *title* of Measure Q of the words “**Student/Veterans’ Affordable Education, Job Training**” is misleading, as it would be unlawful to use Measure Q Bond proceeds for any of those purposes.

The ballot language continues directly thereafter as follows: “To prepare Solano/Yolo County students/veterans for universities/jobs, by:

- Expanding access by students, military, disabled veterans to affordable education”

While the four subsequent bullet-pointed items within the ballot do identify activities appropriately within the scope of Proposition 39, it is difficult to ascertain how a physical building or land acquisition relates to “affordable education”.

In complete contravention to the purpose and limitations of Proposition 39, under the section labeled, “Projects”, Measure Q states:

The Board of Trustees evaluated the District’s urgent and critical needs including completing essential repairs to aging classrooms and college buildings to today’s health and earthquake safety requirements, and providing sufficient classrooms and science labs **to offer more job training and workforce development courses and programs to students, military, and veterans**, facility maintenance, safety and security issues, class size and offerings in key disciplines such as nursing, health sciences, biotechnology solar

and clean technology fields automotive technology and information and computer technology, in developing the scope of the projects to be funded. See Appendix G (Emphasis ours)

References to offering more job training, courses and programs and use of the words “military” and “veterans” is at once misleading (Q monies may not be used for courses or programs. Hiring of new teachers to teach such courses or programs is also a prohibited use of Q funds).

Specifically, bold type and/or use of capitalization are used frequently and throughout the measure in order to provide emphasis and draw the attention of the reader. For example, it is stated that in approving Measure Q projects, the Board of Trustees must:

- PROVIDE ESSENTIAL JOB TRAINING AND WORKFORCE PREPARATION for students, military, and veterans by providing facilities....
- IMPROVING ACCESS TO DISABLED STUDENTS AND WAR VETERANS by expanding job placement programs and facilities...
- EXPAND HIGH QUALITY AFFORDABLE COLLEGE OPTIONS FOR STUDENTS TRANSFERRING TO FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES...
- OFFER MIDDLE COLLEGE OPTIONS TO HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS to allow high school students to start their college work when in high school and earn an Associates degree, saving time and money on their way to a four-year degree. (Emphasis in original)

Again, as indicated, job training is not allowed under Proposition 39, nor are job placement programs. Any relationship between offering high school students college courses or “high quality affordable college options” and buildings, facilities, or land purchases is difficult to understand. While the word “facilities” is used twice, in keeping with the assumption that the average voter would notice only the highlighted areas, Measure Q is presented as being about much more than brick and mortar.

Measure Q Failed to Comply with Key Provisions of Proposition 39

As set forth within the “Impartial Analysis of Measure Q”, prepared by Solano County Counsel, the Solano Community College District (hereinafter referred to as “District”) “must” conduct the annual independent audits as set forth above, “and appoint a citizens’ oversight committee to ensure that the bond proceeds are spent **only for the specific purposes listed in the election order resolution (Appendix H) and for no other purposes.**” (Emphasis ours)

A review of the election order resolution adopted by the District on or about August 1, 2012, indicates that rather than list the specific purposes for which the bond proceeds will be spent, paragraph eight of Resolution No. 12/13-01 simply states:

“WHEREAS, **The Board has approved** each of the Solano College Educational Master Plan and the Solano College Master Facilities Plan (together, the “Master Plans”), each of which sets forth the long-range strategic plans for Solano College and prioritizes their most immediate and critical project needs;” (Emphasis ours)

Section 3 of the same document identifies and incorporates by reference an Exhibit “B” (“Full Text Ballot Proposition of the Solano Community College District Bond Measure Election November 6, 2012”), which purports to itemize the projects to be funded by Measure Q. However, rather than provide an actual project list, Exhibit B also refers the voter to the Master Plans, indicating:

“The Master Plans are on file and available for review at the Solano College President’s Office and include the types of projects listed below.”

As will be outlined in detail below, our investigation revealed that not only was no Facilities Master Plan (hereinafter referred to as FMP) “on file” or “available for review”, and *contrary to the District’s Bond Measure Resolution*, neither a **Board approved** Facilities Master Plan, nor a project list outlining plans for how the \$348 million would be spent actually existed at the time voters went to the polls and approved Measure Q.

Instead of preparing these basic foundational documents, which are necessary for determining the needs of the college, a consultant was retained by the District to ascertain public support levels in terms of the monetary amount of a potential school bond. Said consultant advised the Board of Trustees at the August 1, 2012 meeting that a bond of “as much as \$350 million is potentially viable in November 2012.” The cart was put before the horse—rather than identifying the specific needs of the college, and figuring out the cost of those needs, the District sought first to identify the amount of money it could obtain from the public through a bond measure.

In fact, on August 1, 2012, the date upon which the Board of Trustees (hereinafter referred to as the “Board”), voted to place the bond measure on the ballot, one Trustee specifically expressed concerns that not only had the FMP not been approved by the Board, but projects had not been adequately identified, and there were no specifics as to how the money was going to be allocated. Said Trustee’s recommendation was to instead continue working to **finalize the Master Plans, cost projects out and define the specific needs of the college.**

While the District prepared several “draft” FMP’s leading up to the election, those which actually included monetary figures were all either well below, or far in excess of \$348 million, and are therefore better classified as “shopping lists”, not FMP’s, and certainly not project lists. The absence of an actual plan as to how to spend \$348 million was made evident at the December 5, 2012 Board Meeting, a month after the election, at which time a power point presentation, the contents of which included, “**We have our money, now what?**” was presented.

Concerned about the manner in which the bond measure was presented to the voters, and unable to locate a project list or FMP outlining an actual plan for the \$348 million, members of a local tax group sought to obtain copies of the Master Plans stated to be in the President's Office, and available to the public. Prior to the election, verbal requests to the college's administration and President's office to review the documents referred to in the ballot pamphlet were to no avail.

Additionally, on February 11, 2013, a member of the Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee (hereinafter referred to as "CBOC") asked a representative of the architectural firm whether there was a document in place addressing the District's need for \$348 million before the election. The CBOC member was advised **neither priority lists nor a project list existed prior to that time.**

Informal efforts to obtain the documents purporting to reflect an FMP and/or project list, and purported to be located in the President's Office were unsuccessful. As such, a member of the public prepared a written request for said information via the Public Records Act, directed to the College, on June 19, 2013. The college had still not produced the documentation by September 2013, and in fact did not produce anything responsive to the Public Records Act request until the summer of 2014. **The documents produced at that time did not include the master plans referred to in the ballot measure, and likewise did not contain a project list relative to Measure Q.**

Consistent with the above, minutes of the College Board of Trustee meeting of August 7, 2013 reflect the bond manager advised the Board that the educational and facilities master plans were not yet complete.

Admitting that the college failed to adhere to the requirements of Proposition 39, the Superintendent-President of the college wrote to the Vacaville Reporter on October 27, 2013, explaining that the failure to provide an "exact list of Measure Q projects" on the ballot was calculated so as "to not tie its hands". "Instead, we have taken the time to carefully research exactly **how we will best spend your tax dollars** and have kept in mind the potential for projects that were "on the horizon" but not finalized as we worked to pass the bond." (Emphasis ours)

Approximately seventeen months after the election, on **March 5, 2014**, the final Facilities Master Plan was delivered to the homes of each of the Trustees for review. The proposed date for Board approval was March 19, 2014. The plan was not actually approved until August 20, 2014, nearly two years after Measure Q was submitted to the voters.

III. METHODOLOGY

Documents Reviewed:

- Public Information Document (Appendix B)
- Kitchell Documents (Appendix C)
- Bond Manager Documents (Appendix D)
- Proposition 39 (Article XIII A of the California Constitution) (Appendix E)
- Education Code Sections 15278-15282 (Appendix F)
- Measure Q (Solano Community College District Student/Veterans' Affordable Education, Job Training, Classroom Repair Measure) (Appendix G)
- Solano Community College District Governing Board, Resolution of the Board of Trustees of Solano Community College District Ordering An Election And Establishing Specifications Of The Election Order; Resolution No. 12/13-01 (Appendix H)
- Vacaville Reporter 10-27-2013-SCC New Bond: Citizens Are Invested in the College's Future
- Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee Monthly Newsletter dated May 2014
- Solano Community College Board Agendas and Minutes 2010 - 2015
- Solano Community College District Duties and Responsibilities of the Board
- Solano Community College District Officers and Duties of Officers
- *Foothill-De Anza Community College District v Melvin Emerich* (2007) 158 Cal. App. 4th 11; 69 Cal. Rptr. 3rd 678
- *Taxpayers for Accountable School Bond Spending v. San Diego Unified School District* (2013) 215 Cal. App. 4th 1013, 156 Cal. Rptr. 3rd 449

Interviewed:

- Solano Community College Board of Trustees
- Measure Q Bond Manager
- Members of the Central Solano Citizens/Taxpayer Group
- Solano Community College Superintendent-President
- Kitchell Program Manager
- Members of the Measure Q Citizens Bond Oversight Committee
- Solano County Tax Assessor
- Solano Community College Vice President, Finance and Administration

IV. STATEMENT OF FACTS

Set forth below is a timeline which follows the progress of Measure Q from August 1, 2012, the date the Board voted to approve it as a ballot measure, until approximately February 2015. In accordance with Grand Jury policy, the names of individuals have been redacted and will appear as empty brackets, i.e. []. Additionally, the term EMP (Educational Master Plan) appears within the timeline, but is not germane to this report.

Date	Information	Source
8/1/12	[] will vote no on bond measure. "...is troubled by this measure...her concerns are that she would have been more comfortable if the Educational Master Plan and Facilities Plan were approved. She is uncomfortable with the fact that the document stated the Board has reviewed and prioritized projects, which have not been adequately identified. She is uncomfortable asking her family, friends, and neighbors to increase their property tax assessment when it is not specific how the money is going to be allocated. Trustee [] encouraged the Board to take a deep breath, work diligently to finalize the two documents, cost them out, and define specific needs."	SCC Board Study Session Minutes: August 1, 2012, page 10
8/1/2012	"Consultant recommendations are that a Solano Community College District bond of as much as \$348M is potentially viable in November 2011. The Lew Group recommends that the Board consider proceeding with placing a measure on the November 2012 ballot".	SCC Board Study Session Minutes, August 1, 2012, page 4
10/3/12	Facilities Master Plan Update—[] from vbn/Architecture: "The final plan is still in progress, with some priorities and estimates on costs still being addressed."	SCC Board Study Session Minutes: October 3, 2012, page 10.
	"Master plans change because opportunities change, and whether it is Measure Q or state monies, our facilities plan must foster the needs of the future." []	October 3, 2012, cont., page 11
11/6/12	ELECTION	Bond Passed
12/5/12	Measure Q Update by [], AIA, Kitchell CEM, Project Executive—power point presentation: "We have our money, now what?"	SCC Board Study Session Minutes: December 5, 2012, page 3

1/23/13	Facilities Master Plan: [] gave a PowerPoint presentation on the final draft campus plans associated with facilities master planning. He presented a priority project list and probably [sic] costs for each location, i.e., Fairfield, Vacaville, and Vallejo... "Identified with the probable costs from Measure Q were state funds available amounting to \$31,979,000. The probable costs include campus-wide infrastructure, landscape, contingencies, design and management costs, or 66.7% of total funds available through Measure Q."	SCC Board Special Meeting Minutes: January 23, 2013, page 2
	"The Board requested continued updates until they are comfortable to vote on the proposed Facilities Master Plan."	January 23, 2013, cont., page 3
2/11/13	"[] asked if there was a document in place for the District's need for \$348M before the election, and [] stated this [sic] his [sic] project and priority lists did not exist prior to the November 2012 election."	CBOC Meeting— Fairfield Campus, Minutes, February 11, 2013, page 3
6/5/13	Approval to Extend Agreement with Facilities Master Planning Firm: "...Additional services in Phase 2 include: project management/process planning; extension on finalizing the Facilities Master Plan..."	SCC Board Meeting Minutes, June 5, 2013, page 6
6/19/13	"...[] President of Central Solano Citizen/Taxpayer Group (CSCTG), who requested to formally request records via the Public Records Act, Government Code Sections 6250-6268, Article 1, Section 3b CA Constitution & 5 USC Section 552 as follows: How the College Board of Directors submitted Measure Q to the voters and how it passed. How did SCCD arrive at the bond amount of \$348M. What statute or statutes apply? What was the assessed property value used in the calculation? [] and others wish to view all documents, memos-emails, spreadsheets, letters and any other documents detailing those calculations..."	SCC Board Minutes, June 19, 2013, page 2

	Facilities Master Plan Update presentation by [], Senior Architect, STV/vbn. "Next steps include: Finalize Facilities Master Plan Site Plans".	June 19, 2013, cont., pages 5-6
7/1/13	[], Vice President, Finance and Administration advises "[] will need to provide a check for \$640.00 in order to obtain the documents he has requested via the Public Records Act".	Correspondence dated July 1, 2013 executed by []
8/7/13	[] comments on his June 19, 2013 request for information re Q. "...it has been 33 days since his first request and 15 days since his second request on July 19, 2013, stating the District is obviously over the time allowed by Government Code Section 6253...." "[] asked [] for his patience because of the recent move from the administrative building on the main campus, summer schedules, and the District generally being shorthanded"	SCC Board Study Session Minutes, August 7, 2013, page 2
8/7/13	Executive Bonds Manager, [] hired 7/1/13; Educational & Facilities MP not yet complete.	Measure Q Proposed Program Structure PowerPoint presentation dated 8/7/13, "Findings" section.
9/7/13	Document prepared by [] indicating that as of 9/5/13 the documents requested via Public Records Act have still not been provided by SCC	Chronology re: Measure Q dated 7 September 2013, prepared by []
10/27/13	" <i>SCC's new bond: Citizens are Invested in the college's future</i> " written by [] states, "SCC deliberately elected to not tie its hand with an exact list of Measure Q projects. Instead, we have taken the time to carefully research exactly how we will best spend your tax dollars and have kept in mind the potential for projects that were 'on the horizon' but not finalized as we worked to pass the bond."	10/27/13 article authored by [] Superintendent-President of Solano Community College, and published in the Vacaville Reporter
11/20/13	Bond Update []: "The Facilities Master Plan and Enrollment Management Plan are	SCC Board Minutes, November 20, 2013,

	in progress and should be ready for approval in late December or early January”.	page 5
2/19/14	Bond Update []: “The Educational Master Plan and Facilities Master Plan are available for review. The next steps are to accept in either March or April.”	SCC Board Minutes, February 19 2014, page 4
3/5/14	Measure Q Review []: “[], Executive Bonds Manager, reported that the Educational Master Plan (EMP) and Facilities Master Plan (FMP) have been delivered to the Board members for their final review. The proposed acceptance for both plans is March 19, 2014.”	SCC Board Study Session Minutes, March 5, 2014, page 5
5/2014	“Another notable accomplishment was the board’s recent acceptance of the District’s Educational Master Plan, Facilities Plan, and District Standards. These documents will form the basis of design for the program and are the strategic vision for Measure Q.”	Citizens’ Bond Oversight Committee Monthly Newsletter, dated May 2014, page 5, Executive Bond Manager’s Message
6/4/14	Bond Update []: “At the July Board meeting, the Board will be asked to approve the project list and project budgets. This approval will allow the Program Manager to begin working on the specific projects”.	SCC Board Study Session Minutes, June 4, 2014, page 4
7/11/14	“Highlights of Past Year” []: Includes “Completion of the Facilities Master Plan and Educational Master Plan”.	SCC Board Retreat Minutes, July 11, 2014, page 2
7/16/14	Measure Q Bond Program Update []: Financial Structure/Tranche Information	SCC Board Minutes, July 16, 2014, pages 4-6
8/6/14	Measure Q Bond Spending Plan []: “...first reading for Board input on the Measure Q Bond Spending Plan.” “The Bond Spending Plan will return to the Board for approval at the meeting scheduled August 20, 2014.”	SCC Board Study Session Minutes, August 6, 2014, pages 5 and 6.
8/20/14	Board approval is requested for the Measure Q Bond Spending Plan (BSP). “The BSP includes the complete list of Measure Q Bond Program Projects and currently	SCC Board Minutes, August 20 2014, page 9.

	<p>proposed project budgets. Over the life of the Bond, the project list and budgets will evolve based on the needs of the institution, market factors (including changes to bid conditions and escalation) and project-specific needs and challenges. Changes to the BSP require the approval of the Board.</p> <p>Included in this first version of the Measure Q BSP is the project list and spending plan and a second document that includes historic data related to the development of the plan since the first draft in January 2013. The data includes input from the Board from two study sessions—in July 2014 and August 2014”.</p>	<p>SCC Board Agenda Item 14(g), attached to Board Minutes dated August 20 2014.</p>
9/17/14	<p>Initiation of Measure Q Bond Individual Projects - Board approval is requested for initiation of eight projects as part of the board approved Measure Q Bond Spending Plan (BSP). The BSP includes the complete list of Measure Q Bond Program Projects and Board approved project budgets.</p>	<p>SCC Board Minutes, September 17, 2014, pages 9-10.</p>
	<p>Contract Award to Kitchell CEM “On August 21, 2013, the Governing Board approved item 13(d), the ‘Measure Q Recommended [Operating] Structure’. The structure included an in-house team hired to manage the bond, as well as invoicing and purchasing. The structure also envisioned a consulting program manager hired to manage specific projects...On May 7, 2014, the Governing Board approved item 9c. ‘Program Management Selection’ which included a short form ‘start up’ contract for \$360,000 to allow Kitchell CEM to begin work while negotiation of a long form contract was ongoing.”</p>	<p>SCC Board Agenda Item 14(c), attached to Minutes of November 5, 2014.</p>

In addition to compiling the information contained in the timeline, the 2014-2015 Grand Jury interviewed each of the elected members of the Solano Community College Board of Trustees. Six of the seven admitted they never saw any type of project list, FMP, or other document reflecting specific projects with associated costs or cost estimates at any time prior to the bond

election. They were presented with concepts, “draft” FMP’s with no associated costs, and many power point presentations, but “nothing at all with numbers” until 2014.

It was also noted that there was neither an EMP nor an FMP at the time of the Measure Q election, and that both had been in existence at the time the public voted on the college’s previous bond project, Measure G. In fact, an advisory committee to “help develop” Measure Q was in existence in 2013. (Interviews with Measure Q CBOC members were consistent with those of the Board. While they were aware of “draft” FMP’s, they were not aware of a completed FMP, or any kind of project list or bond spending plan that included numbers until August, 2014.)

One trustee asserted the bond process was entirely legally compliant, and recalled seeing all relevant documents prior to the election. Although the Grand Jury was initially advised that records in support thereof would be forwarded, that statement was subsequently retracted, and the Grand Jury was simply directed to the college website.

As is set forth above, despite their mandated duties and responsibilities, the Board of Trustees were not engaged in the process of developing and monitoring Measure Q. In accordance with their bylaws, included in their duties and responsibilities are the following:

- To rule upon recommendations of the Superintendent-President on site utilization and physical plan development;
- To rule upon recommendations of the Superintendent-President on matters of capital outlay with references to buildings, major improvements and equipment.
- To rule upon recommendations of the Superintendent-President on matters of repairs and maintenance of the buildings, grounds and equipment;
- To require and consider reports from the Superintendent-President of the District concerning the program and conditions of the College.
- **Represent the public interest.** (Emphasis ours)

Board of Trustee interviews revealed that there was some perception that they did a lot of "rubber-stamping" in terms of projects brought to them by Administration, and that with respect to Measure Q in particular, they really did not know what to do with the \$348M. It was also ascertained that the medical and dental benefits included in the Trustee compensation package was, in some cases, sufficient reason alone to seek election.

The Grand Jury also conducted interviews of several members of the administrative and executive staff of the college. It was discovered that some of them considered a draft FMP from August 10, 2012 sufficient to serve as the FMP and project list despite the fact that the list of projects and potential costs far exceeded \$348M, and that it was not what was ultimately placed on the ballot. The Grand Jury noted discrepancies regarding dates and headers within that document, and also found that the document was inconsistent with documents and facts subsequent to August 10, 2012.

These interviews revealed that the difference between a Bond Spending Plan such as the one the Board passed in August 2014, and a project list, is that a project list is more detailed, and contains costs. Using their own definition, it became evident that what was available to the public (not confined to the ballot measure itself) at the time of the election did not meet this criteria, so failed to comply with the law as set forth in Proposition 39.

V. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Finding 1

The language of Measure Q was misleading. While Proposition 39 generally authorizes funding of buildings and land purchases even the name of the measure, “The Solano Community College District Student/Veterans’ Affordable Education Job Training, Classroom Repair Measure”, suggests otherwise.

Recommendation 1

Language used in future school bond proposals be limited to that which is stated in the authorizing statute.

Finding 2

Contrary to statements contained within the actual ballot measure, the Master Plans were not on file and were not available at the time the voters approved the bond.

Recommendation 2

Ensure the accuracy of all statements made to the public.

Finding 3

Contrary to statements contained within the actual ballot measure, no “project list” identifying \$348 Million in cost allocations existed prior to or at the time the citizens voted on Measure Q.

Recommendation 3

No bond measure be presented to the public until such time as a needs assessment consistent with the bond amount requested has been fully completed, reviewed and approved.

Finding 4

The Board of Trustees failed to uphold their Bylaws in representing the public interest in the exercise of their duties in relation to Measure Q.

Recommendation 4

The Board of Trustees, elected by the voters, act in accordance with their Bylaws, roles, duties and responsibilities to the citizens of Solano County.

COMMENTS

The Grand Jury found no evidence of criminal activity on the part of either the Board of Trustees or any employee of SCC; however, the loose manner in which the college conducts its business leaves it open to the potential appearance of misfeasance.

The 2014-15 Grand Jury is aware of the need to upgrade the Solano Community College campuses and Measure Q was presented to accomplish this goal. However, a lack of engagement and oversight by the Board of Trustees, coupled with a cavalier attitude on the part of some of its members is an issue of great concern.

Forty years is too long for a bond measure! Serious consideration should be given to shorter bond measure obligation time for future projects.

REQUIRED RESPONSES

Solano Community College Board of Trustees (Findings All)

COURTESY COPIES

Clerk, Solano County Board of Supervisors
State Board Governing Community Colleges
State Chancellor's Office for Community Colleges
Solano Community College Superintendent-President