1.0 CALL TO ORDER 9:00 a.m.
Dr. McCarthy welcomed the board to the meeting for the Board of Trustees and college administration. He explained that the purpose of the retreat was to review the status of our facilities plans and explore the options available for bringing in funding that would allow the college to complete our bond. Additionally, it would allow the college to address needs that have emerged since the passage of Measure N in 2002.

Dr. McCarthy reviewed the reasons for the shortfall, saying that rising construction costs have inhibited our ability to fully fund the original plan. He noted that a recent study indicated that for every dollar spent on construction in 2002, $1.52 must be spent in 2007.

4.0 Project Update and Work Session
Dan TerAvest, Director of Campus Planning and Construction, made a PowerPoint presentation that gave the board an overview of the progress that has been made in completing facilities bond projects since last August’s board retreat. He summarized the projects in process as well as in the design phase. He projected bid dates for other projects. The board reviewed worksheets, the construction calendar, master budget, and other pertinent documents and discussed its options for completing currently unfunded bond projects. The board strongly supported the need to continue to make improvements to the Napa Valley College campus. They noted the importance of keeping up with other college campuses with whom Napa Valley College must compete for students in providing the best possible facilities for our students. The board agreed to continue to pursue the viability of various funding options.

2.0 Presentation on Voter Trends and Climate Related to Facilities Bonds in California
Community Colleges
Dr. McCarthy noted that, increasingly, colleges that passed general obligation bonds several years ago have had to go out a second time to complete the work the voters previously approved. The board had asked that a bond marketing strategist be present at this board retreat to answer their questions about a possible new bond.

Jared Boigon, bond marketing strategist from the firm of Terris, Barnes, and Walters, made a brief presentation on voter trends and climate related to a potential future bond measure. He stated that recent bond measures for community colleges have passed at an approximately 2/3 success rate. He said that tax extensions were difficult to explain to voters, and approximately $80 million is the maximum that would be realized from a tax extension. He stated that a board decision on a bond measure would have to be made 88 days prior to the election.

Mr. Boigon recommended designing a survey instrument that would test support for various tax rates as well as support for various projects, as outlined by the college. Mr. Boigon said that voters are generally more interested in what is planned for the future, rather than in what has already been accomplished.

He reviewed the pros and cons of placing a bond measure on the ballot for February, June, or November. The board agreed to move forward by gathering information, the first step of which would be strategic polling. The board recommended proceeding so that, if polling suggests, the college would be prepared to move forward for the February election.

Mr. Boigon stressed the importance of getting the survey right so that it would provide the best possible information. He said that much of the preparation for that survey has already been completed, as projects have already been defined by the previous Bond Implementation Plan.

Board members recommended getting out an insert for the local newspaper that focuses on our bond projects and also includes a statement from the Measure N Citizens’ Bond Oversight Committee.

3.0 Review of Financial Options for Raising Money for Currently Unfunded Bond Projects
Using information supplied by Jim Roth, financial consultant from UBS Paine Webber, Dr. Chris McCarthy and Vice President, Business and Finance Scott Miller presented the financial options for raising additional monies for bond projects, including a future bond, a tax extension, or a certificate of participation. They reviewed how much additional funding each of these options would realize, as well as the benefits to taxpayers.

5.0 Approval of Revision of Board Ethics Policy
New accreditation standards developed by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges state that the “governing board shall have a code of ethics that includes a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its codes.” The board reviewed a number of samples provided by the California Community College League and agreed upon a revision that was a combination of two of the samples.