# MONTEREY PENINSULA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

# MEASURE I GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS ELECTION 2002

FINANCIAL AND PERFORMANCE AUDITS

**JUNE 30, 2016** 

# MONTEREY PENINSULA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

# MEASURE I GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS ELECTION 2002

FINANCIAL AUDIT

**JUNE 30, 2016** 

# FINANCIAL AUDIT TABLE OF CONTENTS JUNE 30, 2016

FINANCIAL SECTION	
Independent Auditor's Report	2
Measure I General Obligation Bonds Election 2002	
Balance Sheet	4
Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance	5
Notes to Financial Statements	6
INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT	
Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting and on Compliance and Other Matters Based on an Audit of Financial Statements Performed in Accordance With <i>Government Auditing Standards</i>	13
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS	
Financial Statement Findings	16
Summary Schedule of Prior Audit Findings	17

FINANCIAL SECTION

#### INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT

To the Board of Trustees, Management, and Citizens' Oversight Committee Monterey Peninsula Community College District Monterey, California

### **Report on the Financial Statements**

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of the Monterey Peninsula Community College District's (the District), Measure I General Obligation Bond Funds (Measure I), as of and for the year ended June 30, 2016, and the related notes to the financial statements, as listed in the table of contents.

#### Management's Responsibility for the Financial Statements

Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of these financial statements in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America; this includes the design, implementation, and maintenance of internal control relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

#### **Auditor's Responsibility**

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audit. We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement.

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. The procedures selected depend on the auditor's judgment, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement of financial statements, whether due to fraud or error. In making those risk assessments, the auditor considers internal control relevant to the District's preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the District's internal control. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. An audit also includes evaluating the appropriateness of accounting principles used and the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation.

We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our audit opinion.

### **Opinion**

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the Measure I General Obligation Bond Funds (Measure I) of the District at June 30, 2016, and the respective changes in financial position for the year then ended in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

### **Emphasis of Matter**

As discussed in Note 1, the financial statements present only the Measure I General Obligation Bond Funds (Measure I), and are not intended to present fairly the financial position and changes in financial position of the District in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. Our opinion is not modified with respect to this matter.

### Other Reporting Required by Government Auditing Standards

In accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*, we have also issued our report dated December 16, 2016, on our consideration of the District's Measure I General Obligation Bond Funds (Measure I) internal control over financial reporting and on our tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, grant agreements, and other matters. The purpose of that report is to describe the scope of our testing of internal control over financial reporting and compliance and the results of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on the internal control over financial reporting or on compliance. That report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* in considering the District's Measure I General Obligation Bond Funds (Measure I) internal control over financial reporting and compliance.

Rancho Cucamonga, California

Variner, Time, Day & Co., LLP.

December 16, 2016

# **BALANCE SHEET JUNE 30, 2016**

ASSETS	
--------	--

 Investments
 \$ 9,869,488

 Accounts receivable
 25,506

 Due from other funds
 30,949

 Total Assets
 \$ 9,925,943

### **FUND BALANCE**

Restricted

Capital projects \$ 9,925,943

# STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES, AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCE FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2016

REVENUES	
	Φ 02.420
Interest revenues	\$ 93,420
Other local revenues	25,506_
<b>Total Revenues</b>	118,926
EXPENDITURES	
Services and operating expenditures	13,119
Capital outlay	548_
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	13,667
NET CHANGE IN FUND BALANCE	105,259
FUND BALANCE, BEGINNING OF YEAR	9,820,684
FUND BALANCE, END OF YEAR	\$ 9,925,943

# NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS JUNE 30, 2016

### NOTE 1 - SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING PRINCIPLES

The accounting policies of the Measure I General Obligation Bond Funds (Measure I) conform to accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America as prescribed by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) and the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA).

## **Financial Reporting Entity**

The audited financial statements include only the Measure I General Obligation Bond Funds (Measure I) of Monterey Peninsula Community College District. This Fund was established to account for the receipt of proceeds of general obligation bond issuances and the expenditures of the proceeds under the General Obligation Bonds Election of November 2008. These financial statements are not intended to present fairly the financial position and changes in financial position of the District in compliance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

### **Fund Accounting**

The operations of the Measure I General Obligation Bond Funds (Measure I) are accounted for in a separate set of self-balancing accounts that comprise its assets, liabilities, fund balance, revenues, and expenditures. Resources are allocated to, and accounted for, in the funds based upon the purpose for which they are to be spent and the means by which spending activities are controlled.

### **Basis of Accounting**

The Measure I General Obligation Bond Funds (Measure I) is accounted for using a flow of current financial resources measurement focus and the modified accrual basis of accounting. With this measurement focus, only current assets and current liabilities generally are included on the balance sheet. The statement of revenues, expenditures, and changes in fund balance reports on the sources (revenues and other financing sources) and uses (expenditures and other financing uses) of current financial resources. These fund financial statements do not include the adoption of GASB Statement No. 54, *Fund Balance Reporting and Governmental Fund Type Definitions*, as the District was not required to adopt GASB Statement No. 54 under the reporting requirements of GASB Statement No. 35.

### **Budgets and Budgetary Accounting**

Annual budgets are adopted on a basis consistent with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America for all governmental funds. The District's governing board adopts an operating budget no later than July 1 in accordance with State law. A public hearing must be conducted to receive comments prior to adoption. The District's governing board satisfied these requirements. The Board revises this budget during the year to give consideration to unanticipated revenue and expenditures primarily resulting from events unknown at the time of budget adoption. The District employs budget control by minor object and by individual appropriation accounts. Expenditures cannot legally exceed appropriations by major object account.

# NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS JUNE 30, 2016

#### **Encumbrances**

The District utilizes an encumbrance accounting system under which purchase orders, contracts, and other commitments for the expenditure of monies are recorded in order to reserve that portion of the applicable appropriation. Encumbrances are liquidated when the commitments are paid and all outstanding encumbrances lapse at June 30.

## Fund Balance - Measure I General Obligation Bonds

As of June 30, 2016, the fund balance is classified as follows:

**Restricted** - amounts that can be spent only for specific purposes because of constitutional provisions or enabling legislation, or because of constraints that are externally imposed by creditors, grantors, contributors, or the laws or regulations of other governments.

#### **Use of Estimates**

The preparation of financial statements in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and the reported amounts of revenues and expenditures/expenses during the reporting period. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

#### **Change in Accounting Principles**

In February 2015, the GASB issued Statement No. 72, Fair Value Measurement and Application. This Statement addresses accounting and financial reporting issues related to fair value measurements. The definition of fair value is the price that would be received to sell an asset or paid to transfer a liability in an orderly transaction between market participants at the measurement date. This Statement provides guidance for determining a fair value measurement for financial reporting purposes. This Statement also provides guidance for applying fair value to certain investments and disclosures related to all fair value measurements.

The District has implemented the provisions of this Statement as of June 30, 2016.

In June 2015, the GASB issued Statement No. 76, *The Hierarchy of Generally Accepted Accounting Principles for State and Local Governments*. The objective of this Statement is to identify—in the context of the current governmental financial reporting environment—the hierarchy of generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP). The "GAAP hierarchy" consists of the sources of accounting principles used to prepare financial statements of State and local governmental entities in conformity with GAAP and the framework for selecting those principles. This Statement reduces the GAAP hierarchy to two categories of authoritative GAAP and addresses the use of authoritative and non-authoritative literature in the event that the accounting treatment for a transaction or other event is not specified within a source of authoritative GAAP.

# NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS JUNE 30, 2016

This Statement supersedes GASB Statement No. 55, *The Hierarchy of Generally Accepted Accounting Principles for State and Local Governments*.

The District has implemented the provisions of this Statement as of June 30, 2016.

In December 2015, the GASB issued Statement No. 79, Certain External Investment Pools and Pool Participants. This Statement addresses accounting and financial reporting for certain external investment pools and pool participants. Specifically, it establishes criteria for an external investment pool to qualify for making the election to measure all of its investments at amortized cost for financial reporting purposes. An external investment pool qualifies for that reporting if it meets all of the applicable criteria established in this Statement. The specific criteria address (1) how the external investment pool transacts with participants; (2) requirements for portfolio maturity, quality, diversification, and liquidity; and (3) calculation and requirements of a shadow price. Significant noncompliance prevents the external investment pool from measuring all of its investments at amortized cost for financial reporting purposes. Professional judgment is required to determine if instances of noncompliance with the criteria established by this Statement during the reporting period, individually or in the aggregate, were significant.

If an external investment pool does not meet the criteria established by this Statement, that pool should apply the provisions in paragraph 16 of GASB Statement No. 31, *Accounting and Financial Reporting for Certain Investments and for External Investment Pools*, as amended. If an external investment pool meets the criteria in this Statement and measures all of its investments at amortized cost, the pool's participants also should measure their investments in that external investment pool at amortized cost for financial reporting purposes. If an external investment pool does not meet the criteria in this Statement, the pool's participants should measure their investments in that pool at fair value, as provided in paragraph 11 of GASB Statement No. 31, as amended.

This Statement establishes additional note disclosure requirements for qualifying external investment pools that measure all of their investments at amortized cost for financial reporting purposes and for governments that participate in those pools. Those disclosures, for both the qualifying external investment pools and their participants, include information about any limitations or restrictions on participant withdrawals.

The District has implemented the provisions of this Statement as of June 30, 2016.

#### **NOTE 2 - INVESTMENTS**

## **Policies and Practices**

The District is authorized under California Government Code to make direct investments in local agency bonds, notes, or warrants within the State; U.S. Treasury instruments; registered State warrants or treasury notes; securities of the U.S. Government, or its agencies; bankers acceptances; commercial paper; certificates of deposit placed with commercial banks and/or savings and loan companies; repurchase or reverse repurchase agreements; medium term corporate notes; shares of beneficial interest issued by diversified management companies, certificates of participation, obligations with first priority security; and collateralized mortgage obligations.

# NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS JUNE 30, 2016

### **Investment in County Treasury**

The District is considered to be an involuntary participant in an external investment pool as the District is required to deposit all receipts and collections of monies with their County Treasurer (*Education Code* Section 41001). The fair value of the District's investment in the pool is reported in the accounting financial statements at amounts based upon the District's pro-rata share of the fair value provided by the County Treasurer for the entire portfolio (in relation to the amortized cost of that portfolio). The balance available for withdrawal is based on the accounting records maintained by the County Treasurer, which is recorded on the amortized cost basis.

#### **General Authorizations**

Limitations as they relate to interest rate risk, credit risk, and concentration of credit risk are indicated in the schedules below:

	Maximum	Maximum	Maximum
Authorized	Remaining	Percentage	Investment
Investment Type	Maturity	of Portfolio	in One Issuer
Local Agency Bonds, Notes, Warrants	5 years	None	None
Registered State Bonds, Notes, Warrants	5 years	None	None
U.S. Agency Securities	5 years	None	None
Banker's Acceptance	180 days	40%	30%
Commercial Paper	270 days	25%	10%
Negotiable Certificates of Deposit	5 years	30%	None
Repurchase Agreements	1 year	None	None
Reverse Repurchase Agreements	92 days	20% of base	None
Medium-Term Corporate Notes	5 years	30%	None
Mutual Funds	N/A	20%	10%
Money Market Mutual Funds	N/A	20%	10%
Mortgage Pass-Through Securities	5 years	20%	None
County Pooled Investment Funds	N/A	None	None
Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF)	N/A	None	None
Joint Powers Authority Pools	N/A	None	None

#### **Interest Rate Risk**

Interest rate risk is the risk that changes in market interest rates will adversely affect the fair value of an investment. Generally, the longer the maturity of an investment, the greater the sensitivity of its fair value to changes in market interest rates. The District does not have a formal investment policy that limits investment maturities as a means of managing its exposure to fair value losses arising from increasing interest rates. The District manages its exposure to interest rate risk by investing in the Monterey County Investment Pool. The District maintains an investment of \$9,869,488 with the Monterey County Investment Pool, with an average maturity of 491 days.

# NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS JUNE 30, 2016

#### Credit Risk

Credit risk is the risk that an issuer of an investment will not fulfill its obligation to the holder of the investment. This is measured by the assignment of a rating by a nationally recognized statistical rating organization. The District's investment in the Monterey County Investment Pool is not required to be rated, nor has it been rated as of June 30, 2016.

#### NOTE 3 - FAIR VALUE MEASUREMENTS

The District categorizes the fair value measurements of its investments based on the hierarchy established by generally accepted accounting principles. The fair value hierarchy, which has three levels, is based on the valuation inputs used to measure an asset's fair value. The following provides a summary of the hierarchy used to measure fair value:

Level 1 - Quoted prices in active markets for identical assets that the District has the ability to access at the measurement date. Level 1 assets may include debt and equity securities that are traded in an active exchange market and that are highly liquid and are actively traded in over-the-counter markets.

Level 2 - Observable inputs, other than Level 1 prices, such as quoted prices for similar assets in active markets, quoted prices for identical or similar assets in markets that are not active, or other inputs that are observable, such as interest rates and curves observable at commonly quoted intervals, implied volatilities, and credit spreads. For financial reporting purposes, if an asset has a specified term, a Level 2 input is required to be observable for substantially the full term of the asset.

Level 3 - Unobservable inputs should be developed using the best information available under the circumstances, which might include the District's own data. The District should adjust that data if reasonably available information indicates that other market participants would use different data or certain circumstances specific to the District are not available to other market participants.

Uncategorized - Investments in the Monterey County Investment Pool are not measured using the input levels above because the District's transactions are based on a stable net asset value per share. All contributions and redemptions are transacted at \$1.00 net asset value per share.

The District's fair value measurements are as follows at June 30, 2016:

Investment Type	Fair Value		Uncategorized	
Monterey County Investment Pool	\$	9,866,165	\$	9,866,165

All assets have been valued using a market approach, with quoted market prices.

# NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS JUNE 30, 2016

### NOTE 4 - ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE

The accounts receivable at June 30, 2016, consists of the following: Interest

\$ 25,506

All amounts have been determined by management to be fully collectible.

#### **NOTE 5 - INTERFUND TRANSACTIONS**

Interfund receivable balance at June 30, 2016, consists of the following:

Due from General Fund \$ 30,949

### NOTE 6 - FUND BALANCE

Fund balance is composed of the following element:

Restricted

Capital projects \$ 9,925,943

### NOTE 7 - COMMITMENTS AND CONTINGENCIES

## Litigation

The District is involved in various litigation arising from the normal course of business. In the opinion of management and legal counsel, the disposition of all litigation pending is not expected to have a material adverse effect on the overall financial position of the Measure I General Obligation Bond Funds (Measure I) at June 30, 2016.

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT





# INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING AND ON COMPLIANCE AND OTHER MATTERS BASED ON AN AUDIT OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS

To the Board of Trustees, Management, and Citizens' Oversight Committee Monterey Peninsula Community College District Monterey, California

We have audited, in accordance with the auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, the accompanying financial statements of the Monterey Peninsula Community College District (the District) Measure I General Obligation Bond Funds (Measure I), as of and for the year ended June 30, 2016, and the related notes to the financial statements, and have issued our report thereon dated December 16, 2016.

#### **Emphasis of Matter**

As discussed in Note 1, the financial statements present only the Measure I General Obligation Bond Funds (Measure I), and are not intended to present fairly the financial position and changes in financial position of the District in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. Our opinion is not modified with respect to this matter.

### **Internal Control Over Financial Reporting**

In planning and performing our audit of the financial statements, we considered the District's Measure I General Obligation Bond Funds (Measure I) internal control over financial reporting (internal control) to determine the audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances for the purpose of expressing our opinions on the financial statements, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the District's Measure I General Obligation Bond Funds (Measure I) internal control. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the District's Measure I General Obligation Bond Funds (Measure I) internal control.

A *deficiency in internal control* exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct, misstatements on a timely basis. A *material weakness* is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control, such that there is a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement of the District's Measure I General Obligation Bond Funds (Measure I) financial statements will not be prevented, or detected and corrected, on a timely basis. A *significant deficiency* is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control that is less severe than a material weakness, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance.

Our consideration of internal control was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control that might be material weaknesses or significant deficiencies. Given these limitations, during our audit, we did not identify any deficiencies in internal control that we consider to be material weaknesses. However, material weaknesses may exist that have not been identified.

### **Compliance and Other Matters**

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the District's Measure I General Obligation Bond Funds (Measure I) of the District's financial statements are free of material misstatement, we performed tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements, noncompliance with which could have a direct and material effect on the determination of financial statement amounts. However, providing an opinion on compliance with those provisions was not an objective of our audit and, accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. The results of our tests disclosed no instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under *Government Auditing Standards*.

## **Purpose of This Report**

The purpose of this report is solely to describe the scope of our testing of internal control and compliance and the results of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on the effectiveness of the District's Measure I General Obligation Bond Funds (Measure I) internal control or on compliance. This report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* in considering the District's Measure I General Obligation Bond Funds (Measure I) internal control and compliance. Accordingly, this communication is not suitable for any other purpose.

Rancho Cucamonga, California

Variner, Time, Day & Co., LLP.

December 16, 2016

SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS

# FINANCIAL STATEMENT FINDINGS JUNE 30, 2016

None reported.

# SUMMARY SCHEDULE OF PRIOR AUDIT FINDINGS JUNE 30, 2016

There were no audit findings reported in the prior year's Financial Statement Findings.

# MONTEREY PENINSULA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

# MEASURE I GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS ELECTION 2002

PERFORMANCE AUDIT

**JUNE 30, 2016** 

# PERFORMANCE AUDIT TABLE OF CONTENTS JUNE 30, 2016

Independent Auditor's Report on Performance	1
Authority for Issuance	
Purpose of Issuance	
Authority for the Audit	3
Objectives of the Audit	3
Scope of the Audit	3
Procedures Performed	4
Conclusion	4
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs	5
Summary Schedule of Prior Audit Findings	6

#### INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT ON PERFORMANCE

To the Board of Trustees, Management, and Citizens' Oversight Committee Monterey Peninsula Community College District Monterey, California

We were engaged to conduct a performance audit of Monterey Peninsula Community College District's (the District) Measure I General Obligation Bond Funds (Measure I) for the year ended June 30, 2016.

We conducted this performance audit in accordance with the standards applicable to performance audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our conclusion based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our conclusions based on our audit objectives.

Our audit was limited to the objectives listed within the report which includes determining the District's compliance with the performance requirements as referred to in Proposition 39 and outlined in Article XIIIA, Section 1(b)(3)(C) of the California Constitution. Management is responsible for the District's compliance with those requirements.

In planning and performing our performance audit, we obtained an understanding of the District's internal controls in order to determine if the internal controls were adequate to help ensure the District's compliance with the requirements of Proposition 39 and outlined in Article XIIIA, Section 1(b)(3)(C) of the California Constitution. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the District's internal control.

The results of our tests indicated that the District expended Measure I General Obligation Bond Funds (Measure I) only for the specific projects approved by the voters, in accordance with Proposition 39 and outlined in Article XIIIA, Section 1(b)(3)(C) of the California Constitution.

Rancho Cucamonga, California

Variner Time, Day & Co., LLP.

December 16, 2016

# PERFORMANCE AUDIT JUNE 30, 2016

### **AUTHORITY FOR ISSUANCE**

The Measure I General Obligation Bond Funds were issued pursuant to the Constitution and laws of the State of California (the State), including the provisions of Chapters 1 and 1.5 of Part 10 of the California *Education Code* and other applicable provisions of law.

The Bonds were authorized to be issued pursuant to a request of the District made by a resolution adopted by the Board of Trustees of the District.

The District received authorization from an election held on November 5, 2002, to issue bonds of the District in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed \$145,000,000 to finance the construction and modernization of certain District property and facilities, the acquisition of equipment, and to pay the costs of issuance associated with the Bonds. The proposition required approval by at least 55 percent of votes cast by eligible voters within the District (the Authorization).

In December 2005, the District issued the 2005 General Obligation Refunding Bonds in the amount of \$33,304,385. The Bonds were used to advance refund a portion of the outstanding Bonds from the first series of the authorized Bonds, Series A. The second and third series of authorized Bonds issued was in January 2008; the District issued Series B in the amount of \$9,004,530 and Series C in the amount of \$95,994,770, respectively.

In April 2013, the District issued the \$33,820,000 2013 General Obligation Refunding Bonds, Series A and B. The bonds have a final maturity to occur on August 1, 2021, with interest rates from .335 to 4.00 percent. The net proceeds of \$36,975,456 (representing the principal amount of \$33,820,000 plus premium on issuance of \$3,155,456) from the issuance were used to advance refund a portion of the District's outstanding 2002 General Obligation Bonds, Series C and to pay the cost of issuance associated with the refunding bonds. In addition, the net proceeds were used to advance refund a portion of the District's outstanding 2005 General Obligation Refunding Bonds and to pay the cost of the issuance associated with the refunding bonds.

In May 2016, the District issued the \$105,348,522 2016 General Obligation Refunding Bonds. The Bonds have a final maturity to occur on August 1, 2033, with interest rates from 1.65 to 4.00 percent. The net proceeds of \$106,531,137 (representing the principal amount of \$105,348,522 plus premium on issuance of \$1,182,615) from the issuance were used to advance refund a portion of the District's outstanding 2002 General Obligation Bonds, Series C and to pay the cost of issuance associated with the refunding bonds.

#### PURPOSE OF ISSUANCE

The net proceeds of the Bonds issued under the 2002 Authorization will be used for the purposes specified in the District bond proposition submitted at the Election, which include the financing of the construction, and modernization of certain District property and facilities, the acquisition of equipment and to pay the costs of issuance associated with the Bonds.

# PERFORMANCE AUDIT JUNE 30, 2016

### **AUTHORITY FOR THE AUDIT**

On November 7, 2000, California voters approved Proposition 39, the Smaller Classes, Safer Schools, and Financial Accountability Act. Proposition 39 amended portions of the California Constitution to provide for the issuance of general obligation bonds by school districts, community college districts, or county offices of education, "for the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or replacement of school facilities, including the furnishing and equipping of school facilities, or the acquisition or lease of rental property for school facilities", upon approval by 55 percent of the electorate. In addition to reducing the approval threshold from two-thirds to 55 percent, Proposition 39 and the enacting legislation (AB 1908 and AB 2659) requires the following accountability measures as codified in *Education Code* Sections 15278-15282:

- 1. Requires that the proceeds from the sale of the bonds be used only for the purposes specified in Article XIIIA, Section 1(b)(3)(C) of the California Constitution, and not for any other purpose, including teacher and administrator salaries and other school operating expenses.
- 2. The community college district must list the specific school facilities projects to be funded in the ballot measure, and must certify that the governing board has evaluated safety, class size reduction, and information technology needs in developing the project list.
- 3. Requires the community college district to appoint a citizens' oversight committee.
- 4. Requires the community college district to conduct an annual independent financial audit and performance audit in accordance with the *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States of the bond proceeds until all of the proceeds have been expended.
- 5. Requires the community college district to conduct an annual independent performance audit to ensure that the funds have been expended only on the specific projects listed.

#### **OBJECTIVES OF THE AUDIT**

- 1. Determine whether expenditures charged to the Measure I General Obligation Bond Funds have been made in accordance with the Bond project list approved by the voters through the approval of Measure I.
- 2. Determine whether salary transactions charged to the Measure I General Obligation Bond Funds were in support of Measure I and not for District general administration or operations.

### SCOPE OF THE AUDIT

The scope of our performance audit covered the period of July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016. The population of expenditures tested included all object and project codes associated with the bond projects. The propriety of expenditures for capital projects and maintenance projects funded through other State or local funding sources, other than proceeds of the bonds, were not included within the scope of the audit. Expenditures incurred subsequent to June 30, 2016, were not reviewed or included within the scope of our audit or in this report.

# PERFORMANCE AUDIT JUNE 30, 2016

### PROCEDURES PERFORMED

We obtained the general ledger and the project expenditure reports prepared by the District for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016, for the Measure I General Obligation Bond Funds (Measure I). Within the fiscal year audited, we obtained the actual invoices and other supporting documentation for a sample of expenditures to ensure compliance with the requirements of Article XIIIA, Section 1(b)(3)(C) of the California Constitution and the Measure I as to the approved Bond projects list. We performed the following procedures:

- 1. Determine District procedures for disbursement of funds related to the voter approved Measure I General Obligation Bonds were applied in accordance with laws and regulations, as well as policies approved by the Board of trustees. This will be accomplished through the inspection of specified documents evidencing certain types of transactions and detailed attributes thereof; including, but not limited to, the specific documents related to bid procedures for contracts and services, invoices for services rendered, and other appropriate documents deemed necessary to provide a basis for the results of our objective.
- 2. Review the detailed accounting of expenditures to determine if proceeds are being spent on administrative salaries or any other expense that would otherwise be the obligation of the General Fund.
- 3. From a sample of construction expenditures from the detailed accounting of expenditures, review expenditures to determine if proceeds expended are for specific projects as listed in the voter approved bond language. Expenditures from all projects will be included in the sample.

### **CONCLUSION**

We reviewed construction expenditures totaling 100 percent of all expenditures from the detailed accounting of expenditures. Our sample included transactions totaling \$13,667 of the total expenditures of \$13,667. The results of our tests indicated that, in all significant respects, the District has properly accounted for the expenditures held in the Measure I General Obligation Bond Funds (Measure I) and that such expenditures were made for authorized Bond projects. There were no salaries of administrators charged to the Measure I General Obligation Bond Funds (Measure I) for District general administration or operations. District procedures for disbursement of funds were applied in accordance with laws and regulations, as well as policies approved by the Board of Trustees.

# SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS JUNE 30, 2016

None reported.

# SUMMARY SCHEDULE OF PRIOR AUDIT FINDINGS JUNE 30, 2016

There were no audit findings reported in the prior year's Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs.