



Performance Audit

Orange Cove High School Non-Financial Hardship

Kings Canyon Unified School District

Project No. 50/62265-00-009

Independent Auditor’s Report on Performance 1

Authority and Purpose for Funding 2

Authority for the Audit 2

Scope of the Audit..... 2

Objectives of the Audit 3

Conclusion..... 20

Schedule of School Facility Program Summary of Audit Findings 21

Schedule of School Facility Program Site Grant Adjustments Summary 22

Schedule of School Facility Program Determination of Project Savings..... 23

Schedule of School Facility Program Summary of Final Project Funding 24

Schedule of the Percent the LEA Spent on Hard Construction Costs 25



Independent Auditor's Report on Performance

Governing Board
Kings Canyon Unified School District
Reedley, California

We were engaged to conduct a performance audit of the Kings Canyon Unified School District (the District) *Non Financial Hardship Project No. 50/62265-00-009*, completed on May 29, 2015 and submitted on September 29, 2020.

We conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. 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.

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 51 and outlined in Appendix B contained in the *2020-2021 Guide for Annual Audits of K-12 Local Education Agencies and State Compliance Reporting*, issued by the California Education Audit Appeals Panel. 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 51, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion of the effectiveness of the District's internal controls. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the District's internal controls. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

The results of our tests indicated that the District complied, in all significant aspects, with the performance requirements as referred to in Proposition 51 and outlined in Appendix B contained in the *2020-2021 Guide for Annual Audits of K-12 Local Education Agencies and State Compliance Reporting*, issued by the California Education Audit Appeals Panel except for as described in the Schedule of School Facility Program Summary of Audit Findings at the end of this report.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the District, and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than this specified party.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Eide Bailly LLP".

Fresno, California
September 29, 2021

Authority and Purpose for Funding

Proposition 51 is a California ballot proposition that passed on the November 8, 2016 ballot, approving \$9 billion in bonds to fund construction and improvement of K-12 and community college facilities. The measure designates \$7 billion for K-12 projects falling under four types of projects (new construction, modernization, career technical education facilities, and charter school facilities), and \$2 billion for any facility project for community colleges.

Authority for the Audit

California Code, *Education Code* Section 41024 Commencing April 1, 2017, a local educational agency that receives any funds pursuant to the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998 (Chapter 12.5 (commencing with Section 17070.10) of Part 10 of Division 1 of Title 1) shall annually report a detailed list of all expenditures of State funds, including interest, and of the local educational agency's matching funds for completed projects until all State funds, including interest, all of the local educational agency's matching funds, and savings achieved, including interest, pursuant to Section 17070.63, are expended in accordance with the requirements of the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998, associated regulations, and any accompanying grant agreement signed by a local educational agency. A local educational agency's detailed list of expenditures shall identify expenditures on a project-by-project basis, reflect completed projects that were reimbursed within that fiscal year, and shall clearly indicate the list of projects that have been completed. Any project identified on a local educational agency's detailed list of expenditures pursuant to paragraph (1) that is reported complete during the fiscal year shall be audited.

Scope of the Audit

The scope of our performance audit covered the project period of the Non-Financial Hardship Project No. 50/62265-00-009 completed on May 29, 2015 and submitted on September 29, 2020. The performance audit was conducted using the procedures from this report on pages 4-20 that were taken from Appendix B contained in the *2020-2021 Guide for Annual Audits of K-12 Local Education Agencies and State Compliance Reporting*, issued by the California Education Audit Appeals Panel that is determined to be within project scope. The results of the procedures performed determined that additional procedures were deemed unnecessary. The population of expenditures tested included all project expenditures reported on the final form SAB 50-06 and Detailed Listing of Project Expenditures (DLOPE) funds. The propriety of expenditures for projects funded through other State or local funding sources, other than those reported on the final form SAB 50-06 and DLOPE, were not included within the scope of the audit. Expenditures not recorded on the final form SAB 50-06 and DLOPE were not reviewed or included within the scope of our audit or in this report.

Objectives of the Audit

The objectives of the audit were accomplished by performing the audit procedures listed on pages 3-18 and 89-90 in Appendix B contained in the *2020-2021 Guide for Annual Audits of K-12 Local Education Agencies and State Compliance Reporting*.

1. Identify if the local educational agency has a project ready for audit, verify the project was not approved as a financial hardship project, and if any changes to the project scope were made.
2. Determine whether funds identified by the District on its detailed list of expenditures have been expended in accordance with the requirements of the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998 associated regulations, and any accompanying grant agreement signed by a local educational agency.
3. Verify any statutorily required District matching funds have been deposited in the County School Facility Fund or expended by the District from the matching fund source prior to the "Notice of Completion".
4. Determine whether construction contracts have been made in accordance with provisions of the public contract code concerning competitive bidding and verify the expenditures listed on the DLOPE do not exceed the contracted amounts.
5. Determine if 60 percent of the project funding was spent on hard construction costs.
6. Determine if any transfers of School Facility Project funds out of Fund 35 to other funds are allowable.
7. Verify any interest reported on the final Form SAB 50-06 and savings achieved identified by the local educational agency.
8. Verify a Restricted Maintenance Account has been established, the required amount has been deposited in the Restricted Maintenance Account, and an ongoing major maintenance plan has been developed under the provisions of *Education Code* Sections 17070.75 and 17070.77, and the Grant Agreement Section D, Paragraph 3.
9. Determine adjustments to the grant amounts received by a local educational agency for site purchase, site relocation assistance, site hazardous waste removal, and/or Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) fees based upon the local educational agency's final approved expenditures.
10. Determine if the project was added to the Unfunded List between May and October 2012 and received SAB approval for placement on the Unfunded List on June 5, 2017. If the project was listed on the Unfunded List, determine if computers, printers, or computer carts were purchased in accordance with *Education Code* Section 17071.25(a)(2)(A) and SFP regulation section 1859.51(l) and 1859.61(g).

II. Initial Steps

A. Identify if LEA has project ready for audit

1. Identify if the LEA (LEA) has a project that received a fund release on or after April 1, 2017, was apportioned on or after July 1, 2017, and is complete and ready for audit, needs to be Reduced to Costs Incurred, or reported savings that need to be audited. This is accomplished by determining if a project meets any of the following conditions:
 - a. Project Complete/Ready for Audit - The project was completed during the 2017-2018 or 2018-2019 fiscal years, or during current fiscal year after 2018-2019.
 1. Review the "SFP Expenditure Audit Workload" refreshable report on the OPSC website (K-12 Audit Resources) for a list of completed projects.
<http://www.dgs.ca.gov/opsc/Resources.aspx>
 - b. Reduction to Costs Incurred - The project failed substantial progress and needs to be reduced to costs incurred, or the LEA requested the project be reduced to costs incurred.
 1. Review the "SFP Substantial Progress Audit Workload" refreshable report on the OPSC website (K-12 Audit Resources) for a list of projects ready to be reduced to costs incurred.
 2. Contact the OPSC for a letter to the LEA indicating they failed substantial progress on the project or a letter from the LEA requesting the project be reduced to costs incurred.
 - c. Savings Audit - The LEA reported savings for an applicable SFP project. Review the "SFP Savings Audit Workload" refreshable report on the OPSC website (K-12 Audit Resources) for a list of savings reports submitted by LEAs.
 - d. Audits must be completed within one year of project completion or termination.

Methodology: The District received a fund release after April 1, 2017 and is listed on the SFP Expenditure Audit Workload file on the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) website. The project is not a reduction to costs incurred or savings audit by verifying the District is not listed on the SFP Substantial Progress Audit Workload or the SFP Savings Audit Workload file on the OPSC website, the OPSC project folder did not indicate the project received a letter for failing substantial progress by the OPSC or a submitted letter by the District requesting the project be reduced to costs incurred, and inquiry with management indicated no such request.

Result of testing: This procedure does not indicate whether the District is in compliance or not but verified the District has a project ready for audit.

2. If yes to any of the conditions pursuant to step (1), then perform the audit steps reflected in the subsequent sections of these procedures for any completed projects, projects that failed substantial progress, projects that an LEA requested a reduction to costs incurred, or projects that reported savings.

Methodology: One of the conditions in step 1 indicated that the District has a project ready for audit. The audit steps in section IIA non-financial hardship projects closeout audit and VI unfunded list projects in Appendix B of the *2020-2021 Guide for Annual Audits of K-12 Local Education Agencies and State Compliance Reporting* were performed.

Result of testing: This procedure does not indicate whether the District is in compliance or not but indicates what audit procedures are to be performed from the subsequent sections in Appendix B. See pages 7-20 for the audit procedures performed, methodology of those audit procedures and the results determined to be within the project scope.

3. If the performance of any of the required audit procedures detailed in the subsequent sections results in an audit finding, then the finding shall be presented in the “Schedule of School Facility Program Summary of Audit Findings”.

Methodology: The audit procedures on pages 4-20 will indicate whether the District is in compliance with laws and regulations of the School Facility Program and the project’s grant agreement. Any noncompliance will be indicated on the Schedule of School Facility Program Summary of Audit Findings on page 21.

Result of testing: This procedure does not indicate whether the District is in compliance or not but indicates where findings will be reported. See the Schedule of School Facility Program Summary of Audit Findings on page 21.

B. Documents Needed to Audit—All Projects

1. Obtain the following documents for all projects, by contacting OPSC.
 - a. Letter(s) from the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) detailing what was verified at Substantial Progress and any issues and/or findings identified with the project.
 - b. Final Escrow Statement (If Applicable)
 - c. Appraisal (If Applicable)
 - d. Grant Agreement(s)
 - e. Application for Funding (Form SAB 50-04)
 - f. Project Transaction Detail and Summary
 - g. SAB approval item(s)

- h. Final Form SAB 50-06 Expenditure Report and Detailed Listing of Project Expenditures (DLOPE)
- i. Schedule of School Facility Program — Determination of Savings (If Applicable)
- j. Schedule of School Facility Program — Unspent Funds (If Applicable)
- k. Schedule of School Facility Program — Use of Savings (If Applicable)

Methodology: The items noted above were obtained for project no. 50/62265-00-009, except for the following, which were not applicable to the project: items b, c, j, and k. Additional items obtained include the hard costs calculation, ongoing major maintenance plan, general ledger for fund 35 (School Facility Fund) and the general ledger for project no. 50/62265-00-009.

Result of testing: This procedure does not indicate whether the District is in compliance or not but indicates the items obtained to complete the audit procedures on pages 4-20.

C. Verify if the project is Financial Hardship

1. Verify if the project was granted Financial Hardship (FH) status and determine if the project's FH status expired prior to the project receiving an apportionment for either a design grant, site grant, or construction grant by reviewing the following obtained from the OPSC:
 - a. The SAB Board Item
 - b. FH Approvals Letter(s)

Methodology: Through review of the grant agreement, project transaction detail, and inquiry with management it was determined that the project was not granted financial hardship status.

Result of testing: This procedure does not indicate whether the District is in compliance or not but verifies the project is not a financial hardship project.

D. Changes to project scope

Verify if the OPSC identified if there were any changes to the project scope not approved by the SAB by reviewing the documents provided by the OPSC (i.e. substantial progress report from OPSC). If documents are not available concerning project scope then contact OPSC for verification.

Methodology: The project did not have changes to the project scope verified by reviewing the documentation provided by the OPSC.

Result of testing: This procedure does not indicate whether the District is in compliance or not but verifies the project did not have a change in project scope.

II. Non-Financial Hardship Projects

A. Closeout Audits

1. Verify the Grantee has maintained, over the course of the project, a general ledger that reflects expenditures at a Project-specific level that includes fund, resource, project year, goal, function, and object codes for all expenditures for the Project, including furniture and equipment, as they are described in the California School Accounting Manual, Procedure 301: Overview of the Standardized Accounting Code Structure and Procedure 345: Illustrations Using Account Code Structure pursuant to Grant Agreement (Section F, paragraph 1).

Methodology: The general ledger was obtained and inspected to verify the fund, resource, project year, goal, function, and object codes for all expenditures for the project, including furniture and equipment as described in the California School Accounting Manual were included.

Result of testing: The District is in compliance with this procedure due to a general ledger being maintained at a project-specific level that includes fund, resource, project year, goal, function, and object codes for all expenditures for the Project, including furniture and equipment, as they are described in the California School Accounting Manual, Procedure 301: Overview of the Standardized Accounting Code Structure and Procedure 345: Illustrations Using Account Code Structure pursuant to Grant Agreement (Section F, paragraph 1).

2. 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" by inspecting the SAB's project approval document for the applicable project and supporting accounting records provided by the LEA. The SAB's project approval document for the applicable project can be obtained by contacting OPSC. Non-compliance related to these matching fund requirements will result in an audit finding, with a potential effect that the non-compliance may result in the project being rescinded and potential loss of funding, as determined by the SAB.

Methodology: Verified the total to date District funds or Joint-Use Partner(s) Contribution in the amount of \$8,053,969 on the final SAB 50-06 form is equal to or exceeds the required District share cash contribution in the amount of \$1,483,672 on the SAB approval item document. District funds or Joint-Use Partner(s) Contribution on the final SAB 50-06 form was traced to the general ledger that was provided by the District, which had a date prior to the Notice of Completion date.

Results of testing: The District is in compliance with this procedure by expending the statutorily required matching funds prior to the notice of completion.

3. Determine whether expenditures have been expended in accordance with the laws and regulations governing the SFP. Select a representative sample of the project expenditures reported on the final form SAB 50-06 and DLOPE previously obtained by contacting the OPSC to perform the following procedures:
 - a. For each item selected, agree and trace expenditures reported on the final Form SAB 50-06 and the DLOPE to the supporting documentation (invoices, contract or purchase order, warrant and posting to the general ledger). If amounts selected do not reconcile to the 50-06 and DLOPE, inquire if any of the sampled expenditures are prorated over multiple projects. If the LEA prorated an invoice or contract over multiple projects, verify that the LEA has documentation demonstrating the proration method used.
 - b. Determine if the type of project expenditures reported are eligible in accordance with the laws and regulations of the SFP and/or the advisory listings in the grant agreement (section G and section H). Per *Education Code* Section 41024, the State share of any ineligible expenditure shall be returned to the State.

Methodology: 9 of 88 expenditures were selected as a representative sample. The representative sample is based on the sampling guidance on pages 1-2 in the *2020-2021 Guide for Annual Audits of K-12 Local Education Agencies and State Compliance Reporting*. This sample represents \$2,188,596 out of \$9,537,641 or 22.9% of the population. The population includes all project expenditures reported on the final form SAB 50-06 and DLOPE funds. Each expenditure in the sample was reviewed to determine the following:

- Expenditures were supported by invoices with evidence of proper approval and documentation of receipting goods or services.
- Expenditures reconciled to the SAB 50-60, DLOPE, and general ledger.
- Whether the District used a proration method. If a proration method was used whether the District documented the proration method and the methodology behind it.
- Expenditures are eligible in accordance with laws, regulations, and/or advisory listings.

Result of testing: The District has met the compliance requirements of this procedure through the following conditions:

- The expenditures agreed and traced to the general ledger, invoice, purchase order, and warrant.
- The expenditures reconciled to the final SAB 50-06 and DLOPE.
- The expenditures selected were not prorated over multiple projects.
- The expenditures were eligible in accordance with the laws and regulations of the school facility project and Section G and H in the Grant Agreement.

4. Determine if the expenditures were made within an eligible time frame (prior to completion date) by obtaining the DLOPE. Review all expenditure dates listed in the DLOPE to verify they were within the three or four year time limits.
 - a. A project is deemed complete per the criteria detailed in SFP Regulation Section 1859.104(a)(1)(A) or (B). A project is complete three years from the final fund release for an elementary school and four years for a middle or high school. Review the "Project Transaction Detail" for the final fund release date.
 - b. Expenditures made after the completion date are not eligible for State funding unless the expenditures were under contract prior to the completion date.

Methodology: Dates on the DLOPE and the dates on the general ledger for the items selected for testing in procedure 3 were compared against the invoice date and/or date of service listed on the invoice to ensure the dates were within the eligible time frame.

Result of testing: The District has met the compliance requirement of this procedure by having expenditures listed on the DLOPE that were within the eligible time frame.

5. Verify the final DLOPE grand total for the project reconciles back to the District's general ledger grand total for the project.

Methodology: The total amount on the general ledger of \$9,537,641 was reconciled to the final DLOPE grand total amount of \$9,537,641. Additionally, the expenditures selected for testing in procedure 3 were traced to the general ledger to ensure completeness of the general ledger.

Result of testing: The District has met the compliance requirement of this procedure due to the general ledger reconciling back to the reported amount on the DLOPE.

Planning Costs

6. Obtain any architect/design contracts and perform the following procedures:
 - a. Agree and trace the final contracted amount to the final billed amount.
 - b. Determine if the expenditures reported for an architect/design contract on the final form SAB 50-06 and DLOPE were paid to the architect by agreeing to the LEA's general ledger and final billed amount.

Methodology: This procedure indicates that all architect/design contracts used on the project must be tested. Therefore, 1 of 1 architect/design contracts were tested representing 100% of the population. To determine compliance with this procedure we performed the following:

- Obtained the last invoice from the architect/design vendor to verify the final billed amount.
- Verified the last invoice from the architect/design vendor was supported by proper approval and documentation of receipting goods and services.
- Reviewed the total contract amount to the final billed amount and total expenditures reported on the final form SAB 50-06 and DLOPE for the architect/design vendors selected for testing.
- Traced the final billed amount to the general ledger.

Result of testing: The District has met the compliance requirements of this procedure through the following conditions:

- The final billed amounts agreed and traced to the general ledger, invoice, purchase order, and warrant.
- The final billed amounts agreed to the total amount listed on the contracts and amendments to the contracts.

Construction Costs

7. Select a sample of construction contracts, including change order amounts, and associated final billed amount and perform the following procedures:
 - a. Agree and trace the expenditures and dollar amounts authorized in the contract (after addendums and change orders) to the final billed amounts.
 - b. Agree and trace the expenditures reported on the DLOPE and general ledger to the final billed amounts to ensure the expenditures were not over reported. Any expenditure beyond the contract amount (including change order amounts) is not eligible for State funding.

Methodology: 1 of 1 construction contracts were selected as a representative sample. The representative sample is based on the sampling guidance on pages 1-2 in the *2020-2021 Guide for Annual Audits of K-12 Local Education Agencies and State Compliance Reporting*. This sample represents 100% of the population. The population includes all construction vendors reported on the final form SAB 50-06 and DLOPE. To determine compliance with this procedure we performed the following:

- Obtained the construction contracts including addendums and change orders for the selected sample.
- Agreed and traced the total amount listed on the construction contracts including addendums and change orders to the final billed amount located on the last invoice received from the construction vendor for the specified project and to the general ledger.

- Verified the last invoice from the construction vendor was supported by proper approval and documentation of receipting goods and services.
- Compared the final billed amount to the total expenditures reported on the final form SAB 50-06 and DLOPE for the construction vendors selected for testing.

Result of testing: The District has met the compliance requirements of this procedure through the following conditions:

- The final billed amounts agreed and traced to the general ledger, invoice, purchase order, and warrant.
 - The final billed amounts agreed to the total amount listed on the contracts and amendments to the contracts.
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.

Methodology: The construction contract tested in procedure 7 above was a lease-leaseback contract. As such, the District was not required to abide by the PCC provisions concerning competitive bidding.

Result of testing: The District has met compliance requirements of this procedure.

9. If the District has used a construction manager, agree the amount included in the construction manager contract to the amounts indicated as paid on the final billed amounts. Any expenditure beyond the final billed amount is not eligible for State funding.

Methodology: Not applicable to the project, through inquiry with management and review of the DLOPE construction management expenditures were not reported on the final SAB 50-06 or DLOPE.

Result of testing: This audit procedure does not indicate noncompliance because it is not applicable.

10. Obtain the approval by contacting the OPSC, the approval document that indicates that the LEA's estimate of project costs required that 60 percent of the project funding be spent on hard construction costs. When the LEA submitted their application for funding, they certified that the cost estimate of construction work or construction contract(s) submitted to the Department of State Architect was greater than 60 percent of the total grant. Prepare the table to report the percent the LEA spent on hard construction costs and display the table in the audit report. If audited hard costs are less than 60%, this does not result in an audit finding; the table is to be presented for information purposes only.

	Amount	Percentage
60% of Total Grant	\$1,780,406	60%
Reported Hard Costs and Percentage	\$8,733,704	294%
Audited Hard Costs and Percentage	\$8,733,704	294%
Difference	\$ -	-%

Methodology: According to Appendix B, hard construction costs are defined as funds spent physically constructing a building (brick and mortar costs). The hard construction cost calculation was recalculated using the SAB approval item, the DLOPE, and the final SAB 50-06 form to ensure the project funding was spent on at least 60% of hard construction costs. The reported and audited hard costs do not include site acquisition, planning, tests, inspections, or furniture and equipment costs, relocation assistance, hazardous waste removal, or Department of Toxic Substances Control. The 60% of the total grant did not include grants for site acquisition, relocation assistance, hazardous waste removal, or Department of Toxic Substances Control.

Result of testing: The District is in compliance due to 294% of the project funding was spent on hard construction costs. There were no differences between the District's hard cost calculation obtained and the recalculated hard construction cost calculation.

11. Inspect supporting documentation for any transfers of SFP funds out of Fund 35 (School Facility Fund) to other LEA funds and determine if they are allowable.

Methodology: Not applicable to project, as no transfers of SFP funds were out of Fund 35 (School Facility Fund) to other LEA funds.

Result of Testing: The audit procedure does not indicate noncompliance because it is not applicable.

12. Agree and trace any interest reported on the final form SAB 50-06 to amounts recorded in the general ledger and other interest documentation. Prepare the following table to report the audited amounts.

Reported Interest	\$ -
Audited Interest	\$ -
Difference	\$ -

A difference in audited interest will result in a difference in audited savings funds in procedure 21 or 22.

Methodology: Not applicable to the project, as interest was not earned indicated through review of the final SAB 50-06 form and general ledger detail of Fund 35.

Result of testing: This audit procedure does not indicate noncompliance because it is not applicable.

13. Verify the LEA has (1) established a "Restricted Maintenance Account" for the exclusive purpose of providing ongoing and major maintenance of school buildings, (2) commencing fiscal year 2019-20 has deposited into the account a minimum of three percent (exception for small school districts of the LEA's 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 (3) 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, and Grant Agreement Section D, Paragraph 3.

Methodology: Verified the District established a Restricted Maintenance Account by obtaining the general ledger detail of resource 8150 (Ongoing and Major Maintenance Account). The amount deposited was recalculated using the total general fund expenditures for the 2018-19 and 2019-20 fiscal years. The amount deposited into resource 8150 in fiscal year 2018-19 was more than what was required to be deposited. However, the amount deposited into resource 8150 in fiscal year 2019-20 was less than what was required to be deposited. An ongoing major maintenance plan was obtained and verified for all required elements noted in *Education Code* Sections 17070.75 and 17070.77, and grant agreement section D, Paragraph 3.

Result of testing: The District is not in compliance as they did not deposit the required minimum amount of general fund expenditures for the 2019-2020 fiscal year in accordance with *Education Code* 17070.75.

New Construction Project(s)

Site Purchase

14. Identify if the project received a separate grant for site purchase. If yes, complete procedure 14 and then proceed to procedure 15. If no, any reported site purchase expenditures are not eligible for State Site Purchase Grant funding. In this case, proceed directly to procedure 16.
- Agree and trace the reported amount for the site purchase back to source documents such as the final escrow amount or court orders in condemnation.
 - Identify the lesser of either (a) actual cost paid on final escrow statement for site purchase or (b) appraisal price on appraisal document. The site grant funding is approved by the SAB based on the lesser of the actual costs or the appraised value of the site. The lesser of the two amounts is eligible for State funding (and shall be considered the audited site purchase costs). Exception: if a court ordered amount was higher than the appraisal amount, then the court order (minus costs not related to site purchase) amount for site purchase would be the amount that was eligible for State Site Purchase Grant funding.

- c. Prepare the following table to report the audited amounts.

A	Site Purchase Grant Amount (Approved by SAB)	N/A
B	Reported Amount of Site Purchase	N/A
C	Audited Site Purchase Costs	N/A
D	Difference	N/A
E	Grant Adjustment (C-A)	N/A
F	Final Grant Amount (A+E)	N/A

Methodology: Not applicable to the project, as the project did not receive a separate grant for site purchase verified by reviewing the project transaction detail and summary included in the closeout documents provided by the OPSC.

Result of testing: This audit procedure does not indicate noncompliance because it is not applicable.

15. Verify the number of acres purchased is consistent with the approved acreage from the SAB approval item and complete the following:

Number of Acres Purchased	N/A
Number of Acres Approved	N/A
Difference	N/A

Methodology: Not applicable to the project, as the project did not receive a separate grant for site purchase verified by reviewing the project transaction detail and summary included in the closeout documents provided by the OPSC.

Result of testing: This audit procedure does not indicate noncompliance because it is not applicable.

Site Relocation

16. Identify if the project was approved for and received a separate grant for site relocation assistance. If yes, complete this procedure. If no, any reported site relocation expenditures are not eligible for State Site Relocation Grant funding. In this case, skip to the next numbered procedure.
- Obtain the LEA's reported relocation costs detail and select a sample of reported costs. Agree and trace amounts to warrants and other supporting documents to validate that reported costs are allowable and do not exceed cost allowances pursuant to Title 25, CCR, Section 6000, *Education Code* Sections 17072.13, 17072.35 and the Advisory Listing Detailing Common Eligible and Ineligible Project Expenditures in the Grant Agreement (Section G and H).

- b. Prepare the following table to report the audited amount.

A	Site Relocation Grant Amount (Approved by SAB)	N/A
B	Reported Amount of relocation cost	N/A
C	Audited relocation cost	N/A
D	Difference	N/A
E	Grant Adjustment (C-A)	N/A
F	Final Grant Amount (A+E)	N/A

Methodology: Not applicable to the project, as the project did not receive a separate grant for site relocation assistance verified by reviewing the project transaction detail and summary included in the closeout documents provided by the OPSC.

Result of testing: This audit procedure does not indicate noncompliance because it is not applicable.

Site Hazardous Waste Removal Costs

17. Identify if the project received a separate grant for hazardous waste removal or the LEA reported hazardous waste removal costs. If yes to either, complete this procedure. If neither, skip to the next numbered procedure.
- Select a sample of reported Site Hazardous Waste Removal Costs and trace amounts to supporting contracts or invoices. Verify that reported costs are allowable pursuant to *Education Code Sections 17072.13, 17072.35* and the Advisory Listing(s) Detailing Common Eligible and Ineligible Project Expenditures in the Grant Agreement (Section G and H).
 - Obtain letter from DTSC that clears the site as safe to construct. Review the dates of all reported hazardous waste removal costs. Any costs dated after the date of the letter are not eligible for State Hazardous Waste Removal funding.
 - Prepare the following table to determine the 150% maximum threshold.

A	Final Eligible Grant Amount (Procedure 14(c) – Table Item F)	N/A
B	Multiply by 150 Percent	150%
C	Maximum Eligible Hazardous Waste Costs (A * B = C)	N/A

- d. Prepare the following table to report the audited amounts.

A	Hazardous Waste Removal Grant Amount (Approved by SAB)	N/A
B	Reported Amount of Hazardous Waste Removal	N/A
C	Audited Hazardous Waste Removal Cost	N/A
D	Difference	N/A
E	Grant Adjustment (C-A)	N/A
F	Final Grant Amount (A+E)	N/A
G	Maximum Eligible Hazardous Waste Grant (Procedure 17(c), Item C)	N/A
H	Final Maximum Eligible Grant (Lesser of F or G)	N/A

Methodology: Not applicable to the project, as the project did not receive a separate grant for hazardous waste removal verified by reviewing the project transaction detail and summary included in the closeout documents provided by the OPSC.

Result of testing: This audit procedure does not indicate noncompliance because it is not applicable.

Department of Toxic Substance Control Costs

18. Identify if the project received a separate grant for Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) fees. If yes, complete this procedure. If no, any reported DTSC expenditures are not eligible for State DTSC Grant funding. In this case, skip to the next numbered procedure.

- a. Select a sample of reported DTSC costs and trace to contracts or invoices that support costs. Verify that sampled costs are allowable pursuant to *Education Code* Sections 17072.13, 17072.35 and the Advisory Listing(s) Detailing Common Eligible and Ineligible Project Expenditures in the Grant Agreement (Sections G and H).
- b. Prepare the following table to report the audited amounts.

A	DTSC Fee Grant Amount (Approved by SAB)	N/A
B	Reported Amount of DTSC Fee	N/A
C	Audited DTSC Fee	N/A
D	Difference	N/A
E	Grant Adjustment (C-A)	N/A
F	Final Grant Amount (A+E)	N/A

Methodology: Not applicable to the project, as the project did not receive a separate grant for Department of Toxic Substance Control fees verified by reviewing the project transaction detail and summary included in the closeout documents provided by the OPSC.

Result of testing: This audit procedure does not indicate noncompliance because it is not applicable.

19. Complete the "Schedule of School Facility Program – Site Grant Adjustments", that must be presented in the audit report, using the information from the tables completed in audit procedures 14 through 18 of this section. Note: the LEA will already have completed columns A and B in the schedule. The totals in this schedule will be carried over to the "Schedule of School Facility Program – Summary of Final Funding Determination".

Methodology: See page 22 for the Schedule of School Facility Program – Site Grant Adjustments. This schedule was filled out using the tables on pages 13-16. Amounts are not listed on this table, due to the project not receiving the grants listed in procedures 14 through 18.

Result of testing: This audit procedure does not indicate noncompliance, it is a step to ensure completion of the Schedule of School Facility Program – Site Grant Adjustments on page 22.

20. Verify whether the OPSC, during the fund release review process, identified a date of occupancy that occurred after the submission of the application for funding. Contact OPSC website (K-12 Audit Resource) for verification. If yes, proceed to the next numbered procedure. If the date of occupancy was not identified by OPSC, document in a table the date of occupancy through inspecting any of the following documentation:

1. School Board Minutes
2. Fire Marshall Inspection Letter
3. Copy of news story indicating the date school opened
4. Notice of Completion

Date of Application for Funding	6/3/2013
Date of Occupancy	5/29/2015
Source of Information	Notice of Completion

Methodology: The date of application for funding was obtained by reviewing the signature date on the form SAB 50-04 application for funding. The date of occupancy was obtained by inspecting the final notice of completion.

Result of testing: The District has met the compliance requirements of this procedure by occupying the school site after the original application for funding date.

Determination of Project Savings - New Construction

21. If the District had project savings, obtain the District's calculation of savings on the Non-FH New Construction project on the "Schedule of School Facility Program Determination of Project Savings" and recalculate the amounts reported.

Savings Reported	\$-
Savings Funds Audited	\$-
Difference	\$-

Display the audited Savings Amount in the "Schedule of School Facility Program Determination of Project Savings".

Methodology: See page 23 for the Schedule of School Facility Program Determination of Project Savings. The audited column of the schedule was used to recalculate the project savings, if any. The amounts used were obtained from the final SAB 50-06 form, the DLOPE, the SAB approval item, and results from procedures 1-20.

Result of testing: The District has met the compliance requirements of this procedure by accurately reporting savings obtained on the project.

Determination of Project Savings – Modernization

22. If the District had project savings, obtain the District's calculation of savings on the Non-FH Modernization project on the "Schedule of School Facility Program Determination of Project Savings" and recalculate the amounts reported.

Savings Reported	N/A
Savings Funds Audited	N/A
Difference	N/A

Display the audited Savings Amount in the "Schedule of School Facility Program Determination of Project Savings".

Methodology: Not applicable to the project, as this is a new construction project verified through review of the project transaction detail and summary in the closeout documents obtained from the OPSC.

Result of testing: This audit procedure does not indicate noncompliance because it is not applicable.

23. Display in "Schedule of School Facility Program Summary of Final Project Funding" (Section VII) the total amount to be returned to the State.

Methodology: See page 24 for the Schedule of School Facility Program Summary of Final Project Funding. This schedule shows the project overspent by \$6,570,297 and no funds are to be returned to the State. The amounts used were obtained from the final SAB 50-06 form, the DLOPE, the SAB approval item, and results from procedures 1-20.

Result of testing: The District has met the compliance requirement of this procedure through absence of amounts to be returned to the State on the Schedule of School Facility Program Summary of Final Project Funding on page 24.

VI. Unfunded List Projects

1. Obtain the LEA's listing of purchased computers, printers, and computer carts.

Methodology: Not applicable to the project, as the project was not added to the Unfunded List between May and October 2012 and did not receive SAB approval for placement on the Unfunded List on June 5, 2017. This was verified through the California Department of General Services Project Tracking website, which showed the project was placed on the unfunded list on September 26, 2018.

Result of testing: This audit procedure does not indicate noncompliance because it is not applicable.

2. If computers, printers, or computer carts were purchased, inspect the following documentation to determine if expenditures were made within the scope of the project funded.
 - a. The District must submit a letter or other documents which details:
 1. Location of computers
 2. Use of computers
 3. District's rationale for the amount of computers purchased
 - b. Per *Education Code* Section 17071.25(a)(2)(A) the California classroom loading standard has been used to determine the number of eligible computers.
 1. K-6 = 25 pupils per classroom
 2. 7-8 = 27 pupils per classroom
 3. 9-12 = 27 pupils per classroom
 4. Non-Severe = 13 pupils per classroom
 5. Severe = 9 pupils per classroom

In addition to the above, one additional computer per classroom has been allowed for the teaching station.

Methodology: Not applicable to the project, as the project was not added to the Unfunded List between May and October 2012 and did not receive SAB approval for placement on the Unfunded List on June 5, 2017. This was verified through the California Department of General Services Project Tracking website, which showed the project was placed on the unfunded list on September 26, 2018.

Result of testing: This audit procedure does not indicate noncompliance because it is not applicable.

3. Obtain the number of classrooms approved for the project and type of project approved from the SAB item that approved the project apportionment.

Methodology: Not applicable to the project, as the project was not added to the Unfunded List between May and October 2012 and did not receive SAB approval for placement on the Unfunded List on June 5, 2017. This was verified through the California Department of General Services Project Tracking website, which showed the project was placed on the unfunded list on September 26, 2018.

Result of testing: This audit procedure does not indicate noncompliance because it is not applicable.

4. Calculate the number of eligible computers.
 - a. Eligible computers = (number of classrooms x loading standard (as determined by type of project)) + (1 additional computer (teaching station) x number of classroom).
 - b. Computers reported beyond the calculated eligible computer total are not eligible for State funding.

- c. The amount associated with ineligible computers = number of ineligible computers X amount paid by LEA per computer.

A	Cost of Computers and Related Equipment	N/A
B	Number of Computers Purchased	N/A
C	Average Cost Per Computer (A/B)	N/A
D	Eligible Computers Calculation	N/A
E	Difference (D-B)	N/A
F	Audited – Amount Associated with Ineligible Computers (E*C)	N/A

Methodology: Not applicable to the project, as the project was not added to the Unfunded List between May and October 2012 and did not receive SAB approval for placement on the Unfunded List on June 5, 2017. This was verified through the California Department of General Services Project Tracking website, which showed the project was placed on the unfunded list on September 26, 2018.

Result of testing: This audit procedure does not indicate noncompliance because it is not applicable.

Conclusion

The results of our testing of each procedure in the methodology section indicated that, in all significant respects, the Kings Canyon Unified School District has met the objectives related to Non-Financial Hardship Project No. 50/62265-00-009 except for as described in the Schedule of School Facility Program Summary of Audit Findings. The Kings Canyon Unified School District complied with all requirements, except for as described in the Schedule of School Facility Program Summary of Audit Findings, of Proposition 51 and requirements outlined in Appendix B contained in the *2020-2021 Guide for Annual Audits of K-12 Local Education Agencies and State Compliance Reporting*, issued by the California Education Audit Appeals Panel.

Kings Canyon Unified School District

Project No. 50/62265-00-009

Schedule of School Facility Program Summary of Audit Findings

Section	Procedure	Objective	Finding/Outcome	Site Related Amount (OPSC Amount)	All Other Ineligible Expenditures (CDE Action)
IIA	13(2)	(2) commencing fiscal year 2019-20 has deposited into the account a minimum of three percent (exception for small school districts – see information box below) of the LEA's 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.	The District did not meet the required minimum deposit to the Restricted Maintenance Account for fiscal year 2019-2020. The deficiency amounted to \$149,143.	N/A	N/A

Recommendation

Section IIA, Procedure 13(2)

The District should contribute the deficient amount in a subsequent fiscal year to the Restricted Maintenance Account.

Views of Responsible Officials

Section IIA, Procedure 13(2)

At the conclusion of the audit, management was informed of the deficiency and has already transferred the required amount to the Restricted Maintenance Account during the 2020-2021 fiscal year.

Kings Canyon Unified School District

Project No. 50/62265-00-009

Schedule of School Facility Program Site Grant Adjustments Summary

Site Grant Types	A	B	C	D	E	F
	Grant Amount (Approved by SAB)	Reported Expenditures	Audited Expenditures	Audited Difference (B - C = D)	Grant Adjustment (C - A = E)	Final Grant Amount (A + E = F)
Site Purchase	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Site Relocation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Site Hazardous						
Waste Removal	-	-	-	-	-	-
Department of Toxic						
Substance Control	-	-	-	-	-	-

Kings Canyon Unified School District
Project No. 50/62265-00-009
Schedule of School Facility Program Determination of Project Savings

	<u>Reported</u>	<u>Audited</u>	<u>Difference</u>
A. State Share: Grant Amount (do not include site acquisition, relocation assistance, hazardous waste removal or DTSC grants in this figure)	\$ 1,483,672	\$ 1,483,672	\$ -
B. Plus District Contribution	1,483,672	1,483,672	-
C. Plus Financial Hardship Apportionment	-	-	-
D. District Share: (B + C)	1,483,672	1,483,672	-
E. Plus Interest Earned on State Funds	-	-	-
F. Amounts Financed (A + D + E = F)	2,967,344	2,967,344	-
G. Reported Expenditures to Office of Public School Construction (do not include expenditures related to site acquisition, relocation assistance, hazardous waste removal, or DTSC grants in this figure)	9,537,641	9,537,641	-
H. Amount Overspent (if reported expenditures more than amounts financed) (F - G = H)	(6,570,297)	(6,570,297)	-
I. Amount of Savings (if reported expenditures less than amounts financed) (F - G = I)	-	-	-

Kings Canyon Unified School District
Project No. 50/62265-00-009
Schedule of School Facility Program Summary of Final Project Funding

	<u>Non- Hardship</u>	<u>Department</u>
A. State Share: Grants Received (do not include site purchase, relocation assistance, hazardous waste removal, or DTSC grants in this figure)	\$ 1,483,672	
B. Plus District Contribution	1,483,672	
C. Plus Financial Hardship Apportionment	N/A	
D. District Share (B + C = D)	1,483,672	
E. Plus Audited Interest Earned on State Funds	<u>-</u>	
F. Total Project Financing (A + D + E = F)	<u>2,967,344</u>	
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)	<u>9,537,641</u>	
H. Amount Overspent (if reported expenditures more than project financing) (G - F = H)	<u>(6,570,297)</u>	
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	-	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. Total Amount to be returned to the State (Non-Financial Hardship For Audit Findings and Site Grant Adjustments) (J + K + L = M)	-	
N. Total Amount to be returned to the State - Financial Hardship District (I + J + K + L = N)	N/A	

Kings Canyon Unified School District

Project No. 50/62265-00-009

Schedule of the Percent the LEA Spent on Hard Construction Costs

	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
60% of Total Grant	1,780,406	60%
Reported Hard Costs and Percentage	8,733,704	294%
Audited Hard Costs and Percentage	8,733,704	294%
Difference	-	0%



BETTY T. YEE
California State Controller

December 24, 2021

Superintendent
Kings Canyon Joint Unified
1502 I Street
Reedley, CA 93654-2427

Re: Certification Letter for Kings Canyon Joint Unified, Orange Cove High School, New Construction 50/62265-00-009

The State Controller's Office (SCO) has completed its desk review of the referenced entity's audit report dated September 29, 2021. 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,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "J. James", is written over a light blue horizontal line.

JOEL JAMES, Chief
Financial Audits Bureau
Division of Audits