

To: College Station Independent School District
Date: November 5, 2025
Re: Construction of Administration Building

In November 7, 2023, College Station Independent School District (the “District”) submitted the following proposition which was approved by voters:

Shall the Board of Trustees of the College Station Independent School District be authorized to issue the bonds of the District, in one or more series, in the aggregate principal amount of \$284,975,000 for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, updating, renovating and equipping school facilities consisting of: District-wide safety, security, technology infrastructure and facilities maintenance improvements; Rock Prairie Elementary renovations; A&M Consolidated High School additions and renovations; College Station High School additions and renovations Phase 2 of the Career and Technical Education Facility; College View High School CTE Cosmetology Lab; Middle School Playing Fields and Stadiums; security and renovations at the District’s Central Administration Office; transportation and bus parking; the purchase of necessary sites for school facilities; and the purchase of school buses?

The District had considered purchasing an existing facility and renovating it for use as a replacement administration building. Due to the difficulty in locating a suitable, cost-effective building, the District has asked whether the proposition allows the District to instead construct a new administration building. In short, the proposition does allow the District to use bond proceeds for the construction of a new administration building.

It is inherent in all bond elections that bond proceeds approved by citizens be expended for the purpose for which they were voted. When election orders are not specific as to the projects for which taxes or bond proceeds will be used, the governing body has some discretion to make decisions about how funds will be spent. See *Barrington v. Cokinos*, 338 S.W.2d 133, 143 (Tex. 1960). Courts construe election propositions like other instruments - “the intent of the parties . . . is the dominant ruling factor and . . . they should always be construed in the light of the circumstances surrounding the parties at the time of their making. The law does not require a literal performance, but there must be left to the parties *substantially the benefits expected*. If the changes have not materially detracted from these benefits, there has been a substantial compliance.” *Fletcher v. Ely*, 53 S.W.2d 817,818 (Tex. Civ. App.-Amarillo 1932, writ ref d).



District voters approved and authorized the issuance of bonds for acquiring, **constructing**, updating, renovating and equipping school facilities ... consisting of **security and renovations at the District's Central Administration Office** ... and the **purchase of necessary sites for school facilities**. Clearly, voters authorized an improved and enhanced central administrative District offices and the purchase of land for any school facility, which would include administrative offices. Both options: (1) purchasing and renovating an existing facility *or* (2) constructing a new facility, provide the voters with the stated project – expanded central administrative office space, and therefore, votes receive “substantially the benefits expected.”

600 Congress Avenue
Suite 2150
Austin, Texas 78701
T 512.478.3805
F 512.472.0871

717 North Harwood
Suite 900
Dallas, Texas 75201
T 214.754.9200
F 214.754.9250

8 Greenway Plaza
Suite 1025
Houston, Texas 77046
T 713.980.0500
F 713.980.0510

112 East Pecan Street
Suite 1310
San Antonio, Texas 78205
T 210.225.2800
F 210.225.2984