

DESERT COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
PROPOSITION 39, GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS
(MEASURE B, MARCH 2004)
PERFORMANCE AUDIT


JUNE 30, 2006

DESERT COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
PROPOSITION 39, GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS
(MEASURE B, MARCH 2004)
PERFORMANCE AUDIT

JUNE 30, 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Independent Auditors' Report.....	1
Objectives.....	2
Scope of the Audit.....	2
Background Information.....	2
Procedures Performed.....	3
Results of Procedures.....	3-6
Conclusion.....	6



LUND & GUTTRY LLP / CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS
39700 BOB HOPE DRIVE • SUITE 309 • P.O. BOX 250 • RANCHO MIRAGE, CA 92270-0250
Telephone (760) 568-2242 • Fax (760) 346-8891
www.lundandguttery.com

INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT

The Board of Trustees and
the Citizens' Oversight Committee
Desert Community College District
Palm Desert, California

We have examined the Desert Community College District's (the "District's") compliance with the performance requirements for the District's General Obligation Bonds 2004 Election, Series 2004 A and 2005 Refunding bonds ("Bonds") for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2006, under the applicable provisions of Section 1(b)(3)(c) of Article XIII A of the California Constitution and Proposition 39 as they apply to the Bonds and the net proceeds thereof. Management is responsible for the District's compliance with those requirements. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the District's compliance with those requirements based on our examination.

Our examination was conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants and, accordingly, included examining, on a test basis, evidence about the District's compliance with those requirements and performing such other procedures, as we considered necessary in the circumstances. We believe that our examination provides a reasonable basis for our opinion. Our examination does not provide a legal determination on the District's compliance with specified requirements.

In our opinion, the Desert Community College District complied, in all material respects, with the aforementioned requirements for the year ended June 30, 2006.

September 25, 2006

Lund & Guttery

DESERT COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
PROPOSITION 39, GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS
PERFORMANCE AUDIT

JUNE 30, 2006

OBJECTIVES

The objectives of our Performance Audit were to:

- Document the expenditures charged to the Desert Community College District (the "District") General Obligation Bond Building Fund (the "Bond Fund") established for the bonds and the net bond proceeds deposited into the Bond Fund.
- Determine whether expenditures from July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006, charged to the Bond Fund, have been made in accordance with the bond project authorization approved by the voters through the approval of Measure B in March 2004 ("Bond Projects").
- Note any discrepancies or system weaknesses and provide recommendations for improvement.
- Provide the District Board and the Measure B Citizens' Oversight Committee with a performance audit as required under the requirements of the California Constitution and Proposition 39.

SCOPE OF THE AUDIT

The scope of our Performance Audit covered the period from July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006 and 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 were not included within the scope of our audit. Expenditures incurred subsequent to June 30, 2006 were not reviewed or included within the scope of our audit.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

On March 2, 2004, \$346.5 million in general obligation bonds were authorized by an election held within the District. A Citizens Oversight Committee was appointed in April 2004 to comply with the California Constitution and Education Code. The purpose of the Committee is to inform the public at least annually regarding the appropriate use of the bond proceeds. In August, 2004 the first series of bonds in the amount of \$65,000,000 was issued. These bonds were issued at a premium of \$1,288,727.55 bringing the total proceeds to \$66,288,727.55. The total proceeds from the bonds were received by the District (less the original bond issuance costs) and are to be used to finance the construction, acquisition, furnishing and equipping of District facilities. California Constitution, Article 13A, Section 1(b)(3)(c) requires an annual performance audit be conducted to ensure that funds have been expended only on the specific projects publicized by the District. Also, in June, 2005 a portion of the above bonds were refinanced through the issue of 2005 General Obligation Refunding Bonds (the "Refunding Bonds"). The proceeds of these bonds were used to defease a portion of the above bonds, provide for debt service for the remaining portion of the above bonds and provide additional funding to be used for the District's bond projects.

DESERT COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

PROPOSITION 39, GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS
PERFORMANCE AUDIT

JUNE 30, 2006

PROCEDURES PERFORMED

We obtained the general ledger and the project expenditure summary reports and detail prepared by the District for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2006 for the Bond Fund. 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 Proposition 39/Measure B funding. We performed the following procedures:

- We reviewed the Bond Implementation Plan publicized lists of intended projects.
- We selected a sample of expenditures in the fiscal year ending June 30, 2006 and reviewed supporting documentation to ensure that funds were properly expended on the specific projects outlined on the publicized list and met the requirements for bidding, if applicable.
- We compared total project expenditures to budgets to determine if there were any expenditures in excess of appropriation.
- We verified that funds were generally used for the construction, acquisition, furnishing and equipping of District facilities and we verified that funding was not used for salaries of school administrators or other operating expenses of the District.

RESULTS OF PROCEDURES

The District has put forward the following projects for use of the Series 2004 A and 2005 Refunding bond funding. The District incurred cumulative total costs of \$15,167,598 through June 30, 2006. Of those amounts \$6,650,734 were expended during the fiscal year ended June 30, 2006. The projects are outlined on page 4.

Due to revisions in the Education Master Plan of the District since the authorization of the bonds and the ever changing community demand for different instructional classes, bond projects and their related budgets and costs are periodically adjusted to meet these needs. This may also result in bond projects moving between bond series to accommodate timing issues.

DESERT COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

PROPOSITION 39, GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS
PERFORMANCE AUDIT

JUNE 30, 2006

RESULTS OF PROCEDURES – (continued)

	Actual Costs For Fiscal Year Ended <u>June 30, 2006</u>	Actual Costs August 1, 2004 through <u>June 30, 2006</u>	Total <u>Budget</u>
1. Infrastructure installation and repair	\$ -	\$ 185,573	\$ -
a. Central plant	39,972	100,626	-
b. Sewer system	-	-	-
c. Water and gas system	19,233	19,233	-
d. Fire hydrant loop	10,012	54,219	-
e. Infrastructure master planning	708,510	1,004,819	-
f. Safety	13,334	72,205	-
g. ADA transition plan	40,966	40,966	-
Subtotal	<u>832,027</u>	<u>1,477,641</u>	<u>20,000,000</u>
2. Building and classroom renovation	-	47,344	1,000,000
3. Temporary classroom and office space --			
Phase I	-	1,982,108	2,000,000
Phase II	303,272	393,826	2,000,000
Subtotal	<u>303,272</u>	<u>2,375,934</u>	<u>4,000,000</u>
4. Parking lot design and construction	292,349	4,050,692	5,000,000
5. Site development – main campus	275,902	311,382	3,000,000
6. EIR, planning and drawings for buildings	-	-	-
a. Campus center	271,885	425,334	2,396,055
b. Dining hall reprogramming	3,631	5,680	6,000
c. Nursing and health sciences	193,887	303,315	1,436,735
d. Public safety academy	224,440	351,111	1,844,727
e. IT classroom	131,784	206,162	2,494,558
f. Alumni center	102,646	160,579	546,591
Subtotal	<u>928,273</u>	<u>1,452,181</u>	<u>8,724,666</u>
7. Site development – East valley campus	205,720	556,276	15,000,000
8. Site development – West valley campus	311,679	354,492	500,000
9. Voice over IP communication	7,122	959,276	1,000,000
10. Arts / new scene shop	17,976	17,976	20,000
11. Athletic complex	2,967	2,967	3,000
12. Business building renovation	9,546	9,546	10,000
13. Quickstart projects – unallocated	-	-	2,064,748
a. Gymnasium renovation and repair	129,194	158,882	1,755,100
b. Sidewalk repair	29,021	41,379	41,400
c. Culinary kitchen	386,085	397,357	397,500
d. Fieldhouse restroom and shower	47,619	50,360	50,400
e. Diesel mechanic building floor	13,866	14,932	53,174
f. Meier Lecture Hall roof repair	296,800	309,696	310,000
g. Safety	286,370	304,339	303,500
h. Applied Technology roof repair	-	-	24,178
Subtotal	<u>1,188,955</u>	<u>1,276,945</u>	<u>5,000,000</u>
Contingency reserve	<u>2,274,946</u>	<u>2,274,946</u>	<u>13,377,996</u>
Total	<u>\$ 6,650,734</u>	<u>\$ 15,167,598</u>	<u>\$76,635,662</u>

DESERT COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
PROPOSITION 39, GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS
PERFORMANCE AUDIT

JUNE 30, 2006

RESULTS OF PROCEDURES – (continued)

Each of the projects has been given a specific project identification number within the District's Bond Fund. Budgets for each project are included in the financial reporting system and actual expenditures are matched against this budget.

The following outlines results of testing related to material expenditures incurred as of June 30, 2006. Projects with insignificant expenditures and projects with no activity for the audit period were not included.

Construction management costs have been incurred and shared by all projects. Other costs incurred included the following:

Project 1 – Infrastructure installation and repair

Current year expenditures were incurred for programming, planning and design costs for the entire infrastructure project. Expenditures appear appropriate to the project.

Project 2 – Building and classroom renovation

Current year expenditures were incurred for programming, planning and design costs. Expenditures appear appropriate to the project.

Project 3 – Temporary classroom and office space – Phase 1

Phase I was completed during the fiscal year ended June 30, 2005. Expenditures appear appropriate to the project.

Project 4 – Temporary classroom and office space – Phase 2

Current year expenditures were incurred for the programming, planning and design, construction and equipment costs of phase 2. Expenditures appear appropriate to the project.

Project 5 – Parking lot design and construction

Current year expenditures were incurred for the programming, planning, design and construction of parking lots. The two parking lots fronting Monterey avenue were complete as of June 30, 2005. Expenditures appear appropriate to the project.

Project 6 – Site development – main campus

Current year expenditures were incurred for programming, planning and design, and construction costs for the site development of the main campus. Expenditures appear appropriate to the project.

Project 7 – EIR, planning and drawings for buildings

Current year expenditures were incurred for programming, planning and design costs for the five buildings. Also, expenditures were incurred for construction costs for the Nursing and Health Sciences building. Expenditures appear appropriate to the project.

DESERT COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
PROPOSITION 39, GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS
PERFORMANCE AUDIT

JUNE 30, 2006

RESULTS OF PROCEDURES – (continued)

Project 8 – Site development – East valley campus

Current year expenditures were incurred for programming, planning and design costs for the East valley campus. Expenditures appear appropriate to the project.

Project 9 – Site development – West valley campus

Current year expenditures were incurred for programming, planning and design costs for the West valley campus. Expenditures appear appropriate to the project.

Project 10 – Voice over IP communication

This project was complete as of June 30, 2005. Expenditures appear appropriate to the project.

Project 11 – Arts / New scene shop

Current year expenditures were incurred for programming, planning and design costs for the new scene shop. Expenditures appear appropriate to the project.

Project 12 – Athletic complex

Current year expenditures were incurred for design costs for the athletic complex. Expenditures appear appropriate to the project.

Project 13 – Business building renovation

Current year expenditures were incurred for design costs for the Business building renovation. Expenditures appear appropriate to the project.

Project 14 – Quickstart projects

Current year expenditures were incurred for programming, planning and design, construction and equipment costs for the Quickstart projects. Expenditures appear appropriate to the project.

CONCLUSION

Based upon our procedures performed, we found that for the items tested, the District has properly accounted for the expenditures of the funds held in the Bond Fund and that such expenditures were made on authorized bond projects. Further it was noted that the funds held in the Bond Fund and expended by the District were not expended for salaries of school administrators or other operating expenditures. Our audit does not provide a legal determination on the District's compliance with those requirements.