4/11/2022

ANDERSON VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT SCHOOL FACILITY PROGRAM (SFP) PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT

For Anderson Valley Elementary School Application No. 57/65540-00-004



Application No. 57/65540-00-004 Table of Contents

Page

Independent Auditors' Report on Performance Objectives of the Audit Scope of the Audit Methodology of the Audit Results Summary of Audit Schedules:	1 2 2
Summary of Audit Findings	4
Site Grant Adjustments Summary	5
Determination of Project Savings	6
Summary of Final Project Funding	
Hard Costs	
Restricted Maintenance Account	9



A Professional Accountancy Corporation

INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT ON PERFORMANCE

Board of Trustees Anderson Valley Unified School District Boonville, California

We have examined Anderson Valley Unified School District's compliance with the performance audits required in Education Code Section 41024 for a local education agency that receives any funds pursuant to the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998. Management is responsible for the District's compliance with those requirements. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the District's compliance based on our examination.

We conducted this performance audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America, the standards applicable to performance audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, and Appendix B of the 2021-22 Guide for Annual Audits of K-12 Local Education Agencies and State Compliance Reporting. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

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 Education Code 41024 but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion of the effectiveness of the District's internal control. 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 for application 57/65540-00-004 for Anderson Valley Elementary School in accordance with Education Code 41024 and Appendix B of the 2021-22 Guide for Annual Audits of K-12 Local Education Agencies and State Compliance Reporting, except for the items reported on the Summary of Final Project Funding and the Summary of Audit Findings.

OBJECTIVES OF THE AUDIT

The objectives of the audit were to determine whether expenditures have been expended in accordance with the laws and regulations governing the School Facility Program (SFP) and

To verify the District maintained over the course of the project a general ledger that reflects expenditures as a project specific level that included fund, resource, project, year, goal, function and object codes for all expenditures for the project as they are described in the California School Accounting Manual, Procedure 301 and

To verify any statutorily required District matching funds have been deposited in the County School Facility Fund or expended by the District from the matching funding source prior to the Notice of Completion.

1

Jeff Nigro, CPA, CFE | Elizabeth Nigro, CPA | Shannon Bishop, CPA | Peter Glenn, CPA, CFE | Paul J. Kaymark, CPA

MURRIETA OFFICE 25220 Hancock Avenue, Suite 400, Murrieta, CA 92562 • P: (951) 698-8783 • F: (951) 699-1064 WALNUT CREEK OFFICE 2121 N. California Blvd. Suite 290, Walnut Creek, CA 94596 • P: (844) 557-3111 • F: (844) 557-3444 www.nncpas.com • Licensed by the California Board of Accountancy

SCOPE OF THE AUDIT

We selected a representative sample of the project expenditures reported on the final form SAB 50-06 for application 57/65540-00-004 and detailed listing of project expenditures (DLOPE) that was obtained on the Office of Public School Construction website for the period May 16, 2011 to September 23, 2013.

METHODOLOGY OF THE AUDIT

The project was identified as a Closeout Audit, and accordingly the audit steps utilized were:

- For each item selected as part of a representative sample, we agreed and traced expenditures reported on the final form SAB 50-06 and the DLOPE to the supporting documentation such as invoices, contracts or purchase orders, warrants and posting to the general ledger.
- We determined that the type of project expenditures reported are eligible in accordance with the laws and regulations of the School Facility Program (SFP).
- We determined that the expenditures were made within an eligible time frame by obtaining the DLOPE. We reviewed all expenditure dates listed in the DLOPE to verify they were within the allowable time limit.
- We verified the final DLOPE grand total for the project reconciles back to the District's general ledger grand total for the project.
- We obtained architect contracts and agreed and traced the final contracted amounts to the final billed amount. We verified that expenditures reported for a contract on the final Form SAB 50-06 and DLOPE were paid to the architect by agreeing to the general ledger and final billed amount.
- We selected a sample of construction contracts including change order amounts and agreed and traced the expenditures and dollar amounts authorized in the contract to the final billed amounts, agreed and traced the expenditures reported on the DLOPE and General Ledger to the final billed amounts to ensure the expenditures were not over reported. For construction contracts sampled, we inspected documentation substantiating compliance with provisions of the PCC concerning competitive bidding.
- We utilized the DLOPE to prepare the table and report the percent the District spent on hard construction costs.
- We did not identify any transfers of School Facility Project Funds out of the School Facility Fund.
- We verified the District established a Restricted Maintenance Account for the exclusive purpose of providing ongoing and major maintenance of school buildings, commencing in the fiscal year 2017-18 and continuing through 2020-21 has deposited into the account a minimum of three percent of the total general fund expenditures for the most recent fiscal year and prior fiscal years after receipt of funds including the fiscal year that it received funds and has developed an ongoing major maintenance plan that complies with and is implemented under the provisions of Education Code Sections 17070.75 and 17070.77.

RESULTS

We noted one exception in our testing. The impact of the exception is reported on the Summary of Final Project Funding and the Summary of Audit Findings. In our opinion, with the exception of the noted finding, the District complied with the compliance requirements for the School Facility Program Audits listed and tested above.

Our audit of compliance made for the purpose set forth in the preceding paragraph would not necessarily disclose all instances of noncompliance.

This report is intended for the information of the Board of Trustees and management, however, this report is a matter of public record.

Nigno + Nigro, PC

Murrieta, California March 1, 2022

Summary of Audit Schedules

Application No. 57/65540-00-004 Summary of Audit Findings

Section	Procedure	Objective	Finding/Outcome	Site Related Amount (OPSC Action)	All other Ineligible Expenditures (CDE Action)
IIA.	8	For construction contracts sampled, inspect documentation substantiating compliance with provisions of the PCC concerning competitive bidding. If the construction contracts were required to follow competitive bidding and the LEA did not comply with the provisions of the PCC concerning competitive bidding, then any reported expenditures associated with those contracts are not eligible for State funding.	The District did not retain the documentation to prove that a contract with Telecom Services was competatively bid under the provisions of PCC. The Distict had copies of the contact and the board approval that mentioned that a bid was conducted, but no longer has proof of advertizement or details of responding bidders.	The total amount of the contract claimed on the DLOPE was \$162,042.70	\$ -

Views of Responsible Officials: While the district has many components of the file, which is more than 10 years old, including the contract, notice to proceed, and billing, we understand the expense has been disallowed as the advertisement and rating sheets for bids were not part of the file. We are working with the vendor to see if we can recover any of the missing components. The staff members involved in this process have long since resigned or retired, so we are unsure of the issue as the other files are complete.

The District more than exceeded the match and we will work to determine if any of those expenses can be used in place of the incomplete file in order to not have a disallowable expense. In the future relating to bond projects, we will reach out for consultation and training as to the required elements before we proceed so that all district office staff have a clear understanding of the required file components. Each file will have a checklist identifying the required items to satisfy the audit requirements. Files will be clearly marked and stored in an accessible area.

Application No. 57/65540-00-004 Site Grant Adjustments Summary

Not applicable.

Application No. 57/65540-00-004 *Determination of Project Savings*

		Reported	Audited	Difference	
A.	State Share: Grant Amount (do not include site acquisition, relocation assistance, hazardous waste removal, or DTSC grants in this figure)	\$ 615,885.00	\$ 615,885.00	\$	-
B.	Plus District Contribution	\$ 410,590.00	\$ 410,590.00	\$	-
C.	Plus Financial Hardship Apportionment	\$-	\$ -	\$	-
D.	District Share: $(B + C)$	\$ 410,590.00	\$ 410,590.00	\$	-
E.	Plus Interest Earned on State Funds	\$-	\$ -	\$	-
F.	Amounts Financed (A+D+E=F)	\$ 1,026,475.00	\$ 1,026,475.00	\$	-
G.	Reported Expenditures to Office of Public School Construction (do not include expenditures related to site acquisition, relocation assistance, hazardous wasteremoval, or DTSC grants in this figure):	\$ 2 888 248 00	\$ 2,888,248.00	\$	-
H.	Amount Overspent (if reported expenditures more than amounts financed) (F-G=H)	\$ 1,861,773.00	\$ 1,861,773.00	\$	-
I.	Amount of Savings (if reported expenditures less than amounts financed) (F-G=I)	.» –	\$ -	\$	-

Application No. 57/65540-00-004 Summary of Final Project Funding

		N	on-Hardship	Dept.
A.	State Share: Grants Received (do not include site purchase, relocation assistance, hazardous waste removal, or DTSC grants in this figure)	\$	615,885.00	
B.	Plus District Contribution	\$	410,590.00	
C.	Plus Financial Hardship Apportionment		N/A	
D.	District Share $(B + C = D)$	\$	410,590.00	
E.	Plus Audited Interest Earned on State Funds	\$	-	
F.	Total Project Financing (A + D + E = F)	\$	1,026,475.00	
G.	Reported Expenditures to Office of Public School Construction (do not include expenditures related to site purchase, relocation assistance, hazardous waste removal, or DTSC grants in this figure)	\$	2,888,248.00	
H.	Amount Overspent (if reported expenditures more than project financing) (G - $F = H$)	\$	1,861,773.00	
I.	Amount of Audited Savings (if reported expenditures less than project financing) (F - G =I; also Audited Savings amount on SFP Project Savings Schedule)	\$	-	OPSC
J.	Ineligible Expenditures – Audit Findings from SFP Summary of Audit Findings	\$	162,042.70	CDE
K.	Financial Hardship Grant Adjustment -Expenditures Prior to Fund Release that exceeded District Contribution – Audit Finding from SFP Summary of Audit Findings		N/A	OPSC
L.	Site Grant Adjustments – from Schedule of Site Grant Adjustments Summary	\$	-	OPSC
M.		\$	162,042.70	
N.	Total Amount to be returned to the State - Financial Hardship District $(I + J + K + L = N)$		N/A	

Application No. 57/65540-00-004 Hard Costs

	Amount	Percentage
60% of Total Grant*	\$ 615,885.00	
Reported Hard Costs & Percentage**	\$ 2,047,037.00	199%
Audited Hard Costs & Percentage***	\$ 1,884,994.30	184%
Difference	\$ 162,042.70	16%

*Total Grant (State Share + Districts Contribution)

**Percentage spent on hard construction is the total hard construction expenditures/ total grant (State share + District Contribution)

*** Audited hard cost amount is reduced by ineligible expenditure

Application No. 57/65540-00-004 Restricted Maintenance Account

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Fiscal Year Required Deposit	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Is Dsirtict a Small School District	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Warrant Release Date*	6/30/2018	6/30/2019	6/30/2020	6/30/2021
% Deposit Requirement	3%	3%	3%	3%
Met RMA Requirement?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

*Contribution was made by resource transfer during the year end closing process



MALIA M. COHEN California State Controller

January 24, 2023

Louise Simson Superintendent 12300 Anderson Valley Way Boonville, CA 95415-9101

Re: <u>Certification Letter for Anderson Valley Unified School District, Anderson Valley</u> <u>Elementary School, Modernization 57/65540-00-004</u>

The State Controller's Office (SCO) has completed its desk review of the referenced entity's audit report dated March 23rd, 2022. As a result of the review, we certify that the audit report conforms to the reporting standards contained in the audit guide, *Guide for Annual Audits of K-12 Local Education Agencies and State Compliance Reporting*, Appendix B, prescribed in Title 5, California Code of Regulations, section 19810.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact a member of my LEA staff by telephone at (916) 324-6442, or by email at audsfp@sco.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

JOEL JAMES, Chief Financial Audits Bureau Division of Audits