#### SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND FUNDS (ELECTION OF 2001, SERIES A, B, AND C AND

ELECTION OF 2005, SERIES A, B, C, AND D)

AUDIT REPORT

**JUNE 30, 2013** 

#### SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND FUNDS
(ELECTION OF 2001, SERIES A, B, AND C
AND
ELECTION OF 2005, SERIES A, B, C, AND D)

FINANCIAL AUDIT

**JUNE 30, 2013** 

#### ELECTION OF 2005, SERIES A, B, C, AND D)

#### **JUNE 30, 2013**

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

#### **FINANCIAL SECTION**

Independent Auditors' Report	1
General Obligation Bond Funds (Election of 2001, Series A, B, and C and Election of 2005, Series A, B, C, and D)	
Balance Sheet	3
Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance	4
Notes to Financial Statements	5
INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' 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 Government Auditing Standards	10
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS	
Financial Statement Findings and Recommendations	12
Summary Schedule of Prior Audit Findings	13

### Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Co., LLP Certified Public Accountants

#### INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT

Board of Trustees Citizens' Oversight Committee San Francisco Community College District San Francisco, California

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

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of the General Obligation Bond Funds (Election of 2001, Series A, B, and C and Election of 2005, Series A, B, C, and D) (the Bond Funds) of San Francisco Community College District (the District) and the related notes to the financial statements as of June 30, 2013, 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 statement 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 entity'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 entity'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 our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

#### **Opinion**

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the Bond Funds (Election of 2001, Series A, B, and C and Election of 2005, Series A, B, C, and D) of San Francisco Community College District at June 30, 2013, and the changes in financial position for the year then ended in conformity 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 Bond Funds specific to General Obligation Bonds, Election of 2001, Series A, B, and C and Election of 2005, Series A, B, C, and D, and are not intended to present fairly the financial position and changes in financial position of San Francisco Community College District in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

#### Other Reporting Required by Government Auditing Standards

Vaurinek Trine, Day! Co. LLP

In accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*, we have also issued our report dated January 23, 2014, on our consideration of the District's General Obligation Bond Funds (Election of 2001, Series A, B, and C and Election of 2005, Series A, B, C, and D) 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 General Obligation Bond Funds (Election of 2001, Series A, B, and C and Election of 2005, Series A, B, C, and D) internal control over financial reporting and compliance. Accordingly, this communication is not suitable for any other purpose.

Rancho Cucamonga, California

January 23, 2014



#### ELECTION OF 2005, SERIES A, B, C, AND D)

#### BALANCE SHEET JUNE 30, 2013

	2001		2005		
	Election		Election		 Total
ASSETS		_		_	 
Cash and investments	\$	165,277	\$	58,314,125	\$ 58,479,402
Accounts receivable		7,147		23,410	30,557
Due from other funds		1,262,510			 1,262,510
<b>Total Assets</b>	\$	1,434,934	\$	58,337,535	\$ 59,772,469
LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCE LIABILITIES Accounts payable		5,035	\$	982,555	\$ 987,590
Due to other funds		-		1,262,510	1,262,510
Total Liabilities		5,035		2,245,065	2,250,100
FUND BALANCE					
Restricted		1,429,899		56,092,470	57,522,369
Total Liabilities and					
Fund Balance	\$	1,434,934	\$	58,337,535	\$ 59,772,469

**ELECTION OF 2005, SERIES A, B, C, AND D)** 

### STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES, AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCE FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2013

	2001 Election	2005 Election	Total
REVENUES			
Local revenues	\$ 79,639	\$ 475,481	\$ 555,120
EXPENDITURES			
Salaries and benefits	6,962	156,998	163,960
Professional services and other operating expenditures	6,855	37,612	44,467
Capital outlay	1,359,689	2,777,855	4,137,544
Total Expenditures	1,373,506	2,972,465	4,345,971
EXCESS OF REVENUES UNDER EXPENDITURES	(1,293,867)	(2,496,984)	(3,790,851)
FUND BALANCE, BEGINNING OF YEAR	2,723,766	58,589,454	61,313,220
FUND BALANCE, END OF YEAR	\$ 1,429,899	\$ 56,092,470	\$ 57,522,369

#### NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS JUNE 30, 2013

#### NOTE 1 - SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING PRINCIPLES

The accounting policies of San Francisco Community College District (the District) Bond Funds (the Bond Funds) 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. San Francisco Community College District Bond Funds account for the financial transactions in accordance with the policies and procedures of the California Community Colleges Budget and Accounting Manual.

#### **Financial Reporting Entity**

The financial statements include only the Bond Funds of the District used to account for Proposition 39 Bond projects. These funds were established to account for the expenditures of general obligation bonds issued under the General Obligation Bond Elections of 2001 and 2005. These financial statements are not intended to present fairly the financial position and results of operations of San Francisco Community College District in compliance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

#### **Fund Accounting**

The operations of the Bond Funds are accounted for in a separate set of self-balancing accounts that comprise the 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**

Basis of accounting refers to when revenues and expenditures are recognized in the accounts and reported in the financial statements. Basis of accounting relates to the timing of measurement made, regardless of the measurement focus applied.

Governmental funds are generally accounted for using the modified accrual basis of accounting. Their revenues are recognized in the accounting period in which they become both measurable and available to finance expenditures of the current fiscal period. Expenditures are recognized in the accounting period in which the liability is incurred (when goods are received or services rendered).

#### **Budgets and Budgetary Accounting**

Annual budgets are adopted on a basis consistent with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. 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, 2013

#### **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 are liquidated at June 30 since they do not constitute expenditures or liabilities.

#### **Fund Balance – Governmental Funds**

As of June 30, 2013, the fund balance of the General Obligation Bond Funds (Election of 2001, Series A, B, and C and Election of 2005, Series A, B, C, and D) was classified as follows:

**Restricted** – amounts that can be spent only for specific purposes because of constitutional provisions or enabling legislation, 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.

#### **NOTE 2 - DEPOSITS AND 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.

#### **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.

#### ELECTION OF 2005, SERIES A, B, C, AND D)

#### NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS JUNE 30, 2013

#### **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. Treasury Obligations	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

#### **Summary of Deposits and Investments**

Deposits and investments as of June 30, 2013, consist of the following:

	Reported
	Value
Investment with county treasury - San Francisco County	\$ 58,268,659
Investment with fiscal agent	 210,743
Total Deposits and Investments	\$ 58,479,402

#### **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 manages its exposure to interest rate risk by investing in the County Investment Pool and money market funds.

ELECTION OF 2005, SERIES A, B, C, AND D)

#### NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS JUNE 30, 2013

#### **Specific Identification**

Information about the sensitivity of the fair values of the District's investments to market interest rate fluctuation is provided by the following schedule that shows the distribution of the District's investment by maturity:

	Fair	Maturity
Investment Type	Value	Date
County Treasury - San Francisco County	\$ 58,202,391	880*
Bank of the West Money Market Funds	210,743	N/A
Total	\$ 58,413,134	

<sup>\*</sup> Weighted average days to maturity.

#### **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 County Treasury is not required to be rated, nor has it been rated as of June 30, 2013. Presented below is the minimum rating required by the *California Government Code*, the District's investment policy, or debt agreements, and the actual rating as of the year-end for each investment type.

	Minimum				
	Fair	Legal	Rating		
Investment Type	Value	Rating	June 30, 2013		
County Treasury - San Francisco County	\$ 58,202,391	Not Required	Not Rated		
Bank of the West Money Market Funds	210,743	Not Required	Not Rated		
Total	\$ 58,413,134				

#### **NOTE 3 - ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE**

Accounts receivable at June 30, 2013, consist of the following:

Interest \$ 30,557

#### NOTE 4 - ACCOUNTS PAYABLE

The accounts payable at June 30, 2013, in the amount of \$987,590 represents amounts owed to vendors for both ongoing and completed construction projects.

#### ELECTION OF 2005, SERIES A, B, C, AND D)

#### NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS JUNE 30, 2013

#### NOTE 5 - FUND BALANCE

Fund balance is composed of the following element:

Restricted \$ 57,522,369

#### **NOTE 6 - COMMITMENTS AND CONTINGENCIES**

As of June 30, 2013, the District was committed under various capital expenditure purchase agreements for bond projects totaling approximately \$3.8 million.

#### Litigation

The District is involved in an ongoing investigation conducted by the San Francisco District Attorney's Office for the improper utilization of public funds belonging to the District. At this time, management is not specifically aware that the investigation and subsequent complaint directly involve transactions which were, or should have been, processed through the Bond Funds.

INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT



Certified Public Accountants

### INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' 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

Board of Trustees Citizens' Oversight Committee San Francisco Community College District San Francisco, 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 General Obligation Bond Funds (Election of 2001, Series A, B, and C and Election of 2005, Series A, B, C, and D) (the Bond Funds) of San Francisco Community College District (the District) and the related notes to the financial statements as of and for the year ended June 30, 2013, and have issued our report thereon dated January 23, 2014.

As discussed in Note 1, the financial statements present only the Bond Funds specific to General Obligation Bonds, Election of 2001, Series A, B, and C and Election of 2005, Series A, B, C, and D, and are not intended to present fairly the financial position and changes in financial position of San Francisco Community College District in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

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

In planning and performing our audit of the financial statements, we considered San Francisco Community College District's internal control over financial reporting (internal control) to determine the audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances for the purpose of expressing our opinion on the financial statements, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of San Francisco Community College District's internal control. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the San Francisco Community College District's 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 San Francisco Community College District's 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 over financial reporting was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that might be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses. 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 San Francisco Community College District's General Obligation Bond Funds (Election of 2001, Series A, B, and C and Election of 2005, Series A, B, C, and D) 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 entity's internal control or on compliance. This report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* in considering the entity's internal control and compliance. Accordingly, this communication is not suitable for any other purpose.

Rancho Cucamonga, California January 23, 2014

Vaurinek Trine, Day! Co. LLP

#### ELECTION OF 2005, SERIES A, B, C, AND D)

### FINANCIAL STATEMENT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS JUNE 30, 2013

None reported.

#### ELECTION OF 2005, SERIES A, B, C, AND D)

### SUMMARY SCHEDULE OF PRIOR AUDIT FINDINGS JUNE 30, 2013

None reported.

#### SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND FUNDS
(ELECTION OF 2001, SERIES A, B, AND C
AND
ELECTION OF 2005, SERIES A, B, C, AND D)
PERFORMANCE AUDIT

1 Ett Gittin (CE 11CE)

**JUNE 30, 2013** 

**JUNE 30, 2013** 

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON PERFORMANCE	1
Authority for Issuance	
Purpose of Issuance	
Authority for the Audit	
Objectives of the Audit	
Scope of the Audit	
Procedures Performed	
Conclusion	7



Certified Public Accountants

#### INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON PERFORMANCE

Board of Trustees Citizens' Oversight Committee San Francisco Community College District San Francisco, California

We were engaged to conduct a performance audit of San Francisco Community College District (the District) General Obligation Bond Funds (Election of 2001, Series A, B, and C and Election of 2005, Series A, B, C, and D) for the year ended June 30, 2013.

We conducted our 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 control 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 the Bond Funds 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

Vaurinek, Stine, Day! Co. LLP

January 23, 2014

**JUNE 30, 2013** 

#### **AUTHORITY FOR ISSUANCE**

The General Obligation Bonds are 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 2001 Bonds are authorized to be issued by a resolution adopted by the City and County Board of Supervisors adopted on February 25, 2002, pursuant to resolutions of the Board of Trustees of the District adopted on March 27, 2002 (the Series A Resolution), September 30, 2004 (the Series B Resolution), and March 23, 2006 (the Series C Resolution). The District received authorization at an election held on November 6, 2001, to issue Bonds of the District in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed \$195,000,000 to finance specific construction and renovation projects approved by eligible voters within the District. The proposition required approval by at least 55 percent of the votes cast by eligible voters within the District (the 2001 Authorization). The District received net proceeds of \$38 million, \$110 million, and \$47 million, respectively, from the Bond Series A, B, and C issuance under the 2001 Authorization.

The 2005 Bonds are authorized to be issued by a resolution adopted by the City and County Board of Supervisors adopted on April 4, 2006, pursuant to resolutions of the Board of Trustees of the District adopted on March 23, 2006 (the Series A Resolution), September 27, 2007 (the Series B Resolution), and February 25, 2010 (the Series C Resolution) and (the Series D Resolution). The District received authorization at an election held on November 8, 2005, to issue Bonds of the District in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed \$246,300,000 to finance specific construction and renovation projects approved by eligible voters within the District. The proposition required approval by at least 55 percent of the votes cast by eligible voters within the District (the 2005 Authorization). The District received net proceeds of \$90 million, \$110 million, \$15.6 million, and \$30.7 million, respectively, from the Bond Series A, B, C, and D issuance under the 2005 Authorization.

#### **PURPOSE OF ISSUE**

The net proceeds of the Bonds issued under the 2001 Authorization will be used for the purposes specified in the District bond proposition submitted at the Election, which include new facility construction, renovations, technology infrastructure, and seismic upgrades for approved projects.

The net proceeds of the Bonds issued under the 2005 Authorization will be used for the purposes specified in the District bond proposition submitted at the Election, which include construction, renovation, and land acquisition for approved projects.

#### **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:

#### **JUNE 30, 2013**

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

#### SCOPE OF THE AUDIT

The scope of our performance audit covered the period of July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013. 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, 2013, were not reviewed or included within the scope of our audit or in this report.

#### PROCEDURES PERFORMED

We obtained the general ledger and the project expenditure reports prepared by the District for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2013, for the Bond Funds. 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 Bond Funds as to the approved Bond projects list. We performed the following procedures:

**JUNE 30, 2013** 

### Procedure A - Compliance With the Terms of the Voter Approved General Obligation Bonds and the District's Approved Policies and Procedures

#### **Procedures**

- 1. We will review and evaluate the original bond initiatives placed before the voters for both the 2001 and 2005 bond elections to determine the scope of projects that are approved through the bond. We will review and evaluate the District's approved policies and procedures related to the bond activity. We will select a representative sample of the actual expenditures incurred through the Bond Funds to determine compliances with the bond initiatives and the approved policies and procedures. In the event any questionable expenditures are identified, we will recommend that the District obtain the opinion of legal counsel as to the legality of the expenditure to the Bond Funds.
- 2. Verify that the expenditures of funds were accounted for separately in the accounting records to allow for accountability.
- 3. Select all salary transactions and determine, based on personnel or payroll records and time sheet, amounts expended were in support of the 2001 and 2005 bond elections and not for District general administration or operations.

#### Results

- 1. We included 79 percent of all general expenditures charged to the Bond Funds for the 2012-2013 fiscal year in our examination. Based upon our examination of actual invoices and purchase orders, there were no exceptions noted in the District's procedures related to the disbursement of the Bond Funds. The District used formal bid procedures for those contracts over the construction bid level requirements and informal bid procedures for those contracts below the construction bid level to select contractors for the various projects in accordance with Education Code requirements and District policy.
- 2. The expenditures of the Bond Funds are accounted for in separate funds in the District's general ledger to allow for accountability.
- 3. All salaries expended in the Bond Funds were in support of the 2001 and 2005 bond elections and not for District general administration or operations.

**JUNE 30, 2013** 

#### Procedure B - Compliance With Regulations Related to Bid Procedures as Provided Within State Code Sections Related to Community Colleges and Board Approved Policies

#### Procedure

We will review the District's policies related to contract bid requirements and select a representative sample of project contracts during the 2012-2013 fiscal year that are subject to the bid requirements. We will assess the compliance with the California Public Contract Code Section 20651(b) and relevant District policies and procedures and prepare a schedule of the results of our procedures.

#### Results

The California Public Contract Code Section 20651(b) requires all bid contracts shall be let to the lowest bidder who shall give security as the Board requires, or else reject all bids. The District policies require maintenance of bid documents including: evidence of advertising, bid tally sheets, bids received, and all other information used in awarding a bid. The District had one project go out to formal bid in the current year.

Project	Contractor	In Compliance
Ocean Campus Conlan Hall Restroom Accessibility Upgrade Project	Streamline Builders	Yes

ELECTION OF 2005, SERIES A, B, C, AND D)

#### **JUNE 30, 2013**

#### Procedure C - Review of Process to Approve Change Orders to Previously Approved Contracts

#### Procedure

We will review a representative sample of change orders that have been processed during the 2012-2013 fiscal year to determine whether the change orders have been approved by the San Francisco Community College District Board of Trustees and will prepare a schedule of the original approved contract and the change order(s) affecting the contract along with the dates the change order was approved by the Board of Trustees.

#### Results

Name of Contractor	Original Contract Amount/ Modified Amount	(CC Mo	ange Order D)/Contract odification A) Amount	Change Order (CO)/ Contract Modification (CM) Date	Board Approval Date	Board Approved Prior to Contract Execution
Bovis Lend Lease, Inc.	\$ 104,704,797	\$	998,868	9/28/2012	9/27/2012	Yes
City and County of SF Office of Labor Standards Enforcement	227,766		105,000	11/7/2012	9/27/2012	Yes
Swinerton Management and Consulting	848,280		100,000	2/8/2013	10/2/2012	Yes

ELECTION OF 2005, SERIES A, B, C, AND D)

#### **JUNE 30, 2013**

### Procedure D - Review of Project Budgets and Compliance With Board Approvals for Projects Through the Bond Funds

#### Procedure

We will obtain the approved budgets for each project in place during the 2012-2013 fiscal year and assess the District's compliance with budget monitoring and communication to the Board when project costs have exceeded approved budgets. We will prepare a schedule of projects, the approved budget, and costs incurred through June 30, 2013, with an analysis of funds overspent or available for future expenditure.

#### Results

Project	Original Project Budget	Amended Project Budget	Actual Expenses	Variance	Expected Future Expenses
Chinatown	\$ 15,000,000	\$ 112,515,000	\$ 110,978,128	\$ 1,536,872	\$ 1,186,335
Computer Network	25,883,145	24,256,733	23,536,251	720,482	1,049,233
Performing Arts Center	94,747,525	74,831,469	29,555,765	45,275,704	35,245,499
Renovations/ADA	50,841,584	45,098,704	44,555,584	543,120	471,373

#### **CONCLUSION**

The results of our tests indicated that, in all significant respects, San Francisco Community College District has properly accounted for the expenditures held in the Bond Funds and that such expenditures were made for authorized Bond projects.