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BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING

NOVEMBER 30, 2016

A. Annual Financial and Bond Financial Audits BF 3 & 4
KPMG Engagement Team
- Tracy Hensley – Engagement Partner
- Brianne Wiese – Engagement Senior Manager
- Keith Pew – Engagement Manager

Scope of Audit
- Financial Statements of the Los Angeles Community College District as of and for the years ended June 30, 2016 and 2015

Deliverables
- Independent Auditors’ Report on Basic Financial Statements for the year ended June 30, 2016 and 2015

Timing of Testwork and Reporting
- Fieldwork began on September 8, 2016
- Fieldwork completed on November 30, 2016
- Expected issuance date of final reports on December 7, 2016

Results of Audits
- Basic Financial Statements– Unmodified Opinion
- Internal Control over Financial Reporting– Significant Deficiencies identified:
  - Access and segregation of duties over SAP applications
  - Financial Reporting

Areas of Audit Emphasis
- Proper Accounting and Disclosure under U.S. Generally Accepted Accounting Principles of:
  - Cash and Investments
  - Capital Assets
  - Revenue Recognition
  - Debt
  - Pension and Other Post Employment Benefit Obligations
Required Communications

- Our Responsibilities Under Professional Standards
- Significant Accounting Policies- Described in note 2 to the financial statements
- Critical Accounting Policies and Practices
- Alternative Accounting Treatments Within US GAAP
- Qualitative Aspects of Accounting
- Large or Unusual Transactions for which there is no authoritative literature or guidance
- Management’s Judgments and Accounting Estimates
  - Valuation and disclosures of investments
  - Valuation of Pension and Other Post Retirement Benefits
- Corrected Misstatements
  - CalPERS Miscellaneous and CalSTERS Pension liability and associated expense
- Uncorrected Misstatements
  - Bond expenditures over-accrued in prior year
  - Non GAAP Policies
    - Straight line method of amortization of debt
    - Local tax revenue
    - CalPERS safety pension plan
- Other Information in Documents Containing Audited Financial Statements
- No Disagreements with Management or Significant Difficulties Encountered during the Audit
- No Knowledge of Consultation with Other Accountants
- No Significant issues Discussed, or Subject to Correspondence with Management
- Material communications with management
  - Engagement letter
  - Representation letter
- Independence

Other

- Current Accounting and Reporting Developments
  - GASB Statement No. 75, Accounting and Financial Reporting for Postemployment Benefits Other Than Pensions
- Resources for Audit Committees
- Audit Committee Institute
Presentation to the Finance and Audit Committee

November 30, 2016
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## Key Audit Milestones and Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Scheduled Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrance Meeting</td>
<td>8/03/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final fieldwork - Student Financial Aid</td>
<td>8/08/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final fieldwork - Single Audit - Other Major Program</td>
<td>10/3/16 to 11/4/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final fieldwork - State Compliance</td>
<td>09/12/16 to 11/4/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft single audit and state compliance reports</td>
<td>11/10/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit conference</td>
<td>11/03/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final single audit and state compliance reports</td>
<td>12/07/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original signed management representation letter</td>
<td>12/07/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation to the Board</td>
<td>12/07/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OVERVIEW – FEDERAL AND STATE

- Focus on Compliance and Internal Controls
  - Compliance with Federal and State Regulations and Grantor Terms and Conditions
  - Internal Controls to ensure compliance with Federal and State Regulations

- Total Federal and State Expenditures
  - Federal: $245 million
  - State: $114.7 million of State-funded programs audited for compliance plus the basis of State Apportionment amounting to $460 million.
SCOPE OF THE AUDIT

- Criteria: Uniform Guidance, (Subpart F of Title 2 U.S. CFR Part 200, Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards)

- Period Covered: July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016 (FY 2016)

- Major Programs Tested:
  1. Financial Aid Cluster
  2. Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College and Career Training (TAACCCT) Grants (CFDA 17.282)
     - Los Angeles Health Competency Career Consortium
     - Consortium for Bioscience Credentials
  3. H-1 B Job Training Grant (CFDA 17.268)
  4. CTE Basic Grants to State (Perkins IV)
  5. Higher Education Institutional Aid
PERSPECTIVE

- Major Federal awards were selected for audit based on a Risk Assessment methodology.

- The 2016 audit opinion was unmodified for each of the five (5) federal awards (major programs) audited. The 2015 audit opinion was also unmodified for each of the five (5) federal awards audited.

- No material weaknesses in internal controls over the administration of Federal awards were identified.

- All five (5) prior year findings were properly addressed this year.

- There were twelve (12) findings noted for this year, with questioned costs totaling approximately $32,000.
## COMPLIANCE ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED – 12 Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Compliance Area / Issues</th>
<th>Questioned Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Financial Assistance Cluster (SFA)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Special Tests and Provisions</strong>&lt;br&gt;No Monthly Data Reconciliation of SAS Data Files to Institution Records and Late Reporting to the Direct Loan Servicing System</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finding 001</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career and Technical Education - Basic Grants to State (CTE)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Equipment Management</strong>&lt;br&gt; Enforcement of Policies and Procedures</td>
<td>$5,177 out of $205,884 of sampled equipment items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finding 002</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Higher Education – Institutional Aid (HE)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Equipment Management</strong>&lt;br&gt; Enforcement of Policies and Procedures</td>
<td>$9,615 out of $23,473 of sampled equipment items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finding 003</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College and Career Training (TAACCCT)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Allowable Costs / Costs Principles</strong>&lt;br&gt;Payroll Documentation for Time and Effort</td>
<td>$9,838 out of $58,308 sampled amount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finding 004, 005 and 006</strong></td>
<td><strong>Level of Effort</strong>&lt;br&gt;Level of Service Requirements were not met.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Procurement, Suspension and Debarment</strong>&lt;br&gt;Lack Vendor Status Verification</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COMPLIANCE ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED – 12 Findings (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Compliance Area / Issues</th>
<th>Questioned Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H-1B Job Training Grants (H1B) Finding 007 - 012</td>
<td><strong>Allowable Costs / Costs Principles</strong> Duplicate Payroll Charges</td>
<td>$7,208 out of $12,797 sampled amount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Eligibility</strong> Limited Proof of Review of Participant Information</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Equipment Management</strong> Enforcement of Policies and Procedures</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Level of Effort</strong> Level of Service Requirements were not met.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Procurement, Suspension and Debarment</strong> Lack Vendor Status Verification</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Reporting</strong> Inaccurate Reporting of Recipients Share on Expenditures</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATE COMPLIANCE AUDIT

SCOPE OF THE AUDIT

- Criteria: CDAM (Contracted District Audit Manual for Fiscal Year 2015-2016 issued by the Chancellor’s Office for California Community Colleges)

- Period Covered: July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016 (FY 2016)

- Scope of Campuses for FY2016:
  - Full Scope (all applicable compliance requirements)
    - East Los Angeles College
    - Los Angeles Mission College
    - Los Angeles Pierce College
  - Limited Scope (selected compliance requirements only based on FY 2015 audit findings)
    - Los Angeles City College - Section 479
    - Los Angeles Harbor College - Sections 479
    - Los Angeles Trade-Technical College - Section 425 and 475
    - West Los Angeles College – Section 427 and Section 474
STATE COMPLIANCE AUDIT

PERSPECTIVE

- Of six (6) prior year findings, five (5) were implemented and one (1) is repeated this year.

- There were four (4) compliance findings reported this year, three (3) were new (S-2016.001, S-2016.003, and S-2016.004) and one (1) was repeated from 2014.

- Questioned costs totaled $26,000.
## COMPLIANCE ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED – 4 Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Requirements</th>
<th>Compliance Area / Issues</th>
<th>Questioned Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residency Determination of Credit Courses Finding 001</td>
<td>Admission Application Forms are missing for Sampled Student Athletes (2 out of 20 samples)</td>
<td>$14,974 (3.17 credit FTES exceptions x $4,723.60 credit FTES reimbursement rate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent Enrollment of K-12 Students in Community College Credit Courses Finding 002</td>
<td>There were students enrolled in courses that were not included in the courses approved by the school principal in the application for admission forms. (12 out of 50 samples)</td>
<td>$9,353 (1.98 credit FTES exceptions x $4,723.60 credit FTES reimbursement rate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Be Arranged Hours Finding 003</td>
<td>TBA Course Classification - 1 out of 2 TBA courses sampled was deemed to be an invalid TBA course.</td>
<td>$850 (0.18 credit FTES exceptions x $4,723.60 credit FTES reimbursement rate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Student Program and Services Finding 004</td>
<td>Advisory Committee Meetings - The Advisory Committee did not conduct an annual meeting for FY16.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Matters

- The management and staff of the District offices and the colleges involved with the audit were responsive to our inquiries and cooperative fully in meeting our requests for interviews, documents, and data.

- We experienced no disagreements with management over matters of audit significance nor did we encounter difficulty in dealing with management during the audit process.

- We appreciate the courtesy and cooperation extended to us during the audit, and we are available to respond to questions or provide other assistance to the District upon request.
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INTRODUCTION
December 7, 2016

The Members, Board of Trustees
Los Angeles Community College District

Dear Board of Trustees:

I have reviewed and am pleased to submit the Annual Financial Report of the Los Angeles Community College District (District) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016. This report is presented in six sections, which include an introduction, the Independent Auditors’ Report, the Management’s Discussion and Analysis, the Basic Financial Statements, the Supplemental Financial Information, and Other Supplemental Information as noted in the table of contents. The report includes all Funds of the Los Angeles Community College District as well as those of student organizations.

The introductory section contains my remarks to the Annual Financial Report and a brief summary of the District’s employment and enrollment. The Independent Auditors’ Report provides the auditors’ opinion of the audit. The Management’s Discussion and Analysis provides the management information and analysis on the District’s financial changes and condition for the year. The basic financial statements include the three financial statements, as well as the notes to the basic financial statements. Supplementary information includes the combining and individual funds and account group financial statements and schedules, a description of the organization of the District, a schedule of full-time equivalent students and apprenticeship clock hours, and a reconciliation of the financial statements to the Annual Financial and Budget report submitted to the state of California. Also included in this section are the independent auditors’ reports on the internal accounting and administrative controls of the District as well as the state and federal compliance required by the California State Department of Finance and the Single Audit Act of 1984. The final section provides the current year’s audit findings and recommendations as well as the implementation status of the auditors’ prior year recommendations.

The District is responsible for the accuracy, completeness, and fairness of the financial statements, including all disclosures. We believe that the data presented are accurate in all material respects and present fairly the financial activities of the District’s various funds, and that the informative disclosures are sufficient to provide an understanding of the District’s fiscal affairs. The auditors’ opinion included in the annual report reflects our belief.

The District and its nine campuses provide a broad range of educational services to students within the Los Angeles area. The nine Los Angeles community colleges comprise one of the nation’s largest community college systems—the result of a movement, which had its beginning in the California State Legislature in 1907, the year the Caminiti Bill was passed, permitting high schools to offer postgraduate courses. The Ballard Act of 1917 and the Deering Act of 1929 assured financial support for the state’s community colleges.
In March 1931, a separate Los Angeles Junior College District was created and granted a taxing power of its own and was designed to serve a larger area than the city. The Board of Education and the Superintendent of Los Angeles County Schools assumed administrative control of the District. Due to the dramatic expansion during the post-war period, the state’s two-year junior colleges were moved away from the secondary education system and into higher education. In 1967, Governor Reagan authorized establishment of a Board of Governors for the California Community Colleges. In that same year, legislation passed which provided for a separate community college Board of Trustees and administration. The first Trustees of the Los Angeles Community College District were sworn into office on July 1, 1969.

The Los Angeles Community College District serves approximately 233,324 students, employs approximately 3,838 full-time and 6,551 part-time personnel and covers a service area of more than 882 square miles.

**Enrollment**

The Los Angeles Community College District’s enrollment for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016 decreased by 1.2% from previous year.

The enrollment figures (credit student headcount) by campus for the 2015-16 fiscal year were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Los Angeles College</td>
<td>28,093</td>
<td>27,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles City College</td>
<td>17,838</td>
<td>16,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Harbor College</td>
<td>9,945</td>
<td>9,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Mission College</td>
<td>10,062</td>
<td>9,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Pierce College</td>
<td>20,669</td>
<td>19,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Southwest College</td>
<td>6,807</td>
<td>6,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Trade–Technical College</td>
<td>13,677</td>
<td>13,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Valley College</td>
<td>17,946</td>
<td>17,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Los Angeles College</td>
<td>9,773</td>
<td>9,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Television</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Districtwide</strong></td>
<td>135,319</td>
<td>129,128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Los Angeles Community College District’s FTES (Full-time equivalent student) figures for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016, the measure by which the state of California funds Community Colleges increased by 2.7% from 104,695 in fiscal year 2015, to 107,601 in fiscal year 2016. Fiscal year 2016 enrollment by campus are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Noncredit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Los Angeles College</td>
<td>23,137</td>
<td>1,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles City College</td>
<td>12,124</td>
<td>1,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Harbor College</td>
<td>6,946</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Mission College</td>
<td>6,353</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Pierce College</td>
<td>15,238</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Southwest College</td>
<td>5,038</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Trade–Technical College</td>
<td>12,305</td>
<td>1,038</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Noncredit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Valley College</td>
<td>12,640</td>
<td>783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Los Angeles College</td>
<td>7,349</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Television</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Districtwide</strong></td>
<td><strong>101,464</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,137</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your attention is directed to the Independent Auditors’ Report, the Management’s Discussion and Analysis, and the Basic Financial Statement sections, which represent the complete representation of the District’s financial information.

Sincerely,

Francisco Rodriguez, Ph.D.  
Chancellor
Independent Auditors’ Report

The Honorable Board of Trustees
Los Angeles Community College District:

Report on the Financial Statements

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of the Los Angeles Community College District (the District), which comprise the statements of net position as of and for the year ended June 30, 2016 and 2015, and the related statements of revenue, expenses, changes in net position and cash flows for the years then ended, and the related notes to the financial statements, which collectively comprise the District’s basic financial statements as listed in the table of contents.

Management’s Responsibility for the Financial Statements

Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of these financial statements in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles; 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.

Auditors’ Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express opinions on these financial statements based on our audits. We conducted our audits 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 from 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 auditors’ judgment, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement of the 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 policies used and the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the financial statements.

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

Opinion

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the respective financial position of the Los Angeles Community College District as of June 30, 2016 and 2015, and the respective changes in financial position and cash flows for the years then ended in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles.
Emphasis of Matters

As discussed in note 2 to the financial statements, effective July 1, 2015, the District adopted the provisions of Governmental Accounting Standards Board Statement No. 72, *Fair Value Measurement and Application*. Effective July 1, 2014, the District adopted the provisions of Governmental Accounting Standard Board Statement No. 68, *Accounting and Financial Reporting for Pensions – an amendment of GASB Statement No. 27*, and GASB Statement No. 71, *Pension Transition for Contributions Made Subsequent to the Measurement Date – an amendment of GASB Statement No. 68*. Our opinion is not modified with respect to these matters.

Other Matters

Required Supplementary Information

U.S. generally accepted accounting principles require that the management’s discussion and analysis on pages 5–15, the schedule of postemployment benefits funding progress and employer contributions on page 45, and the schedule of the District’s proportionate share of the net pension liability and schedule of the District contributions on page 46, be presented to supplement the basic financial statements. Such information, although not a part of the basic financial statements, is required by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board who considers it to be an essential part of financial reporting for placing the basic financial statements in an appropriate operational, economic, or historical context. Management’s discussion and analysis does not include a discussion of 2015 information that U.S. generally accepted accounting principles require to supplement, although not required to be part of, the basic financial statements. We have applied certain limited procedures to the required supplementary information in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America, which consisted of inquiries of management about the methods of preparing the information and comparing the information for consistency with management’s responses to our inquiries, the basic financial statements, and other knowledge we obtained during our audit of the basic financial statements. We do not express an opinion or provide any assurance on the information because the limited procedures do not provide us with sufficient evidence to express an opinion or provide any assurance.

Supplemental and Other Information

Our audit was conducted for the purpose of forming opinions on the financial statements that collectively comprise the District’s basic financial statements. The accompanying supplemental financial information on pages 52–69 and the reconciliation of governmental funds to the statements of net position on page 73 are presented based on the requirements of the *Contracted District Audit Manual issued by the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office* and for purposes of additional analysis and are not a required part of the basic financial statements.

The accompanying supplemental financial information and the reconciliation of governmental funds to the statement of net position is the responsibility of management and was derived from and relates directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the basic financial statements. Such information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the basic financial statements and certain additional procedures, including comparing and reconciling such information directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the basic financial statements or to the basic financial statements themselves, and other additional procedures in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. In our opinion, the accompanying supplementary information is fairly stated, in all material respects, in relation to the basic financial statements as a whole.

The supplemental information on pages 52–69 and 73, has not been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the basic financial statements, and accordingly, we do not express an opinion or provide any assurance on it.
Other Reporting Required by Government Auditing Standards

In accordance with Government Auditing Standards, we have also issued our report dated December 7, 2016 on our consideration of the District’s internal control over financial reporting and on our tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and 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 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 internal control over financial reporting and compliance.

Los Angeles, California
December 7, 2016

(signed) KPMG LLP
MANAGEMENT’S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS
This section presents Management’s Discussion and Analysis (MD&A) of the Los Angeles Community College District’s (the District) financial activities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016. The MD&A has been prepared by management and should be read in conjunction with the basic financial statements and the notes thereto, which follow this section.

Financial Highlights

- The assets of the District exceeded its liabilities as of June 30, 2016 by $407.9 million (net position). Of this amount, a net deficit of $381.3 million is unrestricted net position. This includes a one-time adjustment of $475.6 million during FY 2015 due to the implementation of GASB 68, Accounting and Financial Reporting for Pensions. $316.5 million (restricted net position) may be used for the District’s ongoing obligations related to programs with internal and external restrictions. The remaining component of the District’s net position represents $472.7 million of net amounts invested in capital assets.

- The District’s investment in capital assets (net of depreciation) increased by $169.5 million during the year ended June 30, 2016 due to construction activity.

- The District’s total noncurrent liabilities increased by $50.1 million during the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016.

Overview of the Basic Financial Statements

The District follows the financial reporting guidelines established by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) Statement No. 34, Basic Financial Statements – and Management’s Discussion and Analysis – for State and Local Governments, and GASB Statement No. 35, Basic Financial Statements – and Management’s Discussion and Analysis – for Public Colleges and Universities – an amendment of GASB Statement No. 34. These statements require the District to report its basic financial statements at an entity-wide level under the business-type activity-reporting model. This MD&A is intended to serve as an introduction to the District’s basic financial statements. The District’s basic financial statements include four components: (1) statements of net position; (2) statements of revenue, expenses, and changes in net position; (3) statements of cash flows; and (4) notes to basic financial statements. This report also contains other supplemental information in addition to the basic financial statements themselves.

The statements of net position represents the entire District’s combined assets, deferred outflows of resources, liabilities, deferred inflows of resources and net position, including Associated Student Organization’s financial information. Changes in total net position as presented on the statements of net position are based on the activities presented in the statement of revenue, expenses, and changes in net position. The statement of revenue, expenses, and changes in net position represents the revenue received, operating and nonoperating, and any other revenue, expenses, gains, and losses received or spent by the District. The statement of cash flows presents detailed information about the cash activities of the District during the year. The purpose of these basic financial statements is to summarize the financial information of the District, as a whole, and to present a long-term view of the District’s finances.
Statements of Net Position

The statement of net position presents the assets, liabilities, and net position of the District as of the end of the 2016 and 2015 fiscal years. The statement of net position is a point-in-time financial statement. The purpose is to present to the readers of the basic financial statements a fiscal snapshot of the District. The statements of net position presents end-of-year data concerning assets (current and noncurrent), deferred outflow of resources, liabilities (current and noncurrent), deferred inflow of resources, and net position. From the data presented, readers of the statements of net position are able to determine the assets available to continue the operations of the institution. Readers are also able to determine how much the institution owes vendors, investors, and lending institutions.

Finally, the statement of net position provides a picture of the net position and their availability for expenditure by the institution. Net position is divided into three major categories. The first category, net investment in capital assets, provides the institution’s equity in property, plant, and equipment owned by the institution. The second category is restricted net position, which is divided into two categories, nonexpendable and expendable. The corpus of nonexpendable restricted resources is only available for investment purposes. Expendable restricted net position is available for expenditure by the institution but must be spent for purposes as determined by donors and/or external entities that have placed time or purpose restrictions on the use of the assets. The final net position category is unrestricted. Unrestricted net position is available to the institution for any lawful purpose of the institution.

Statement of Revenue, Expenses, and Changes in Net Position

Changes in total net position as presented on the statements of net position are based on the activities presented in the statements of revenue, expenses, and changes in net position. The purpose of these statements is to present the revenue received by the District, operating and nonoperating, and any other revenue, expenses, gains, and losses received or spent by the District.

Generally speaking, operating revenue is received for providing goods and services to the various customers and constituencies of the institution. Operating expenses are those expenses paid to acquire or produce the goods and services provided in return for the operating revenue and to carry out the mission of the District. Nonoperating revenue is revenue received for which goods and services are not provided. For example, state appropriations are nonoperating because they are provided by the Legislature to the institution without the legislature directly receiving commensurate goods and services for those revenues.
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Management’s Discussion and Analysis
June 30, 2016 and 2015

Financial Analysis of the District as a Whole
As of June 30, 2016, the District’s net position increased by $69.4 million from $338.5 million at June 30, 2015 to $407.9 million at June 30, 2016. Current and other assets decreased by $312.5 million and capital assets increased by $169.5 million. Deferred outflow of resources increased by $48.2 million. Current liabilities decreased by $154.0 million and noncurrent liabilities increased by $50.1 million. Deferred inflow of resources decreased by $60.2 million.

Summary Schedule of Net Position
June 30, 2016 and 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Increase (decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assets:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current and other assets</td>
<td>$848,976,437</td>
<td>1,161,426,770</td>
<td>(312,450,333)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital assets, net</td>
<td>4,294,376,707</td>
<td>4,124,877,476</td>
<td>169,499,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total assets</td>
<td>5,143,353,144</td>
<td>5,286,304,246</td>
<td>(142,951,102)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred outflow of resources</td>
<td>253,420,440</td>
<td>205,210,809</td>
<td>48,209,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total assets and deferred outflow of resources</td>
<td>5,396,773,584</td>
<td>5,491,515,055</td>
<td>(94,741,471)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liabilities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current liabilities</td>
<td>363,060,232</td>
<td>517,051,135</td>
<td>(153,990,903)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncurrent liabilities</td>
<td>4,574,093,711</td>
<td>4,524,016,327</td>
<td>50,077,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total liabilities</td>
<td>4,937,153,943</td>
<td>5,041,067,462</td>
<td>(103,913,519)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred inflow of resources</td>
<td>51,732,543</td>
<td>111,924,595</td>
<td>(60,192,052)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total liabilities and deferred inflow of resources</td>
<td>4,988,886,486</td>
<td>5,152,992,057</td>
<td>(164,105,571)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net position:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net investment in capital assets</td>
<td>472,655,914</td>
<td>341,506,171</td>
<td>131,149,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted – expendable</td>
<td>315,504,002</td>
<td>439,392,377</td>
<td>(123,888,375)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted – Nonexpendable</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>(381,272,819)</td>
<td>(443,375,550)</td>
<td>62,102,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total net position</td>
<td>$407,887,097</td>
<td>338,522,998</td>
<td>69,364,099</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In fiscal year 2016, the District added $266.5 million of capital assets, capitalized interest of $36.6 million and depreciated $133.6 million of capital assets. See further discussions in Capital Assets and Debt Administration at page 13 for additional detail.

Current and other assets decreased $312.5 million. The net decrease is due in part to the following:

1. $274.9 million decrease in restricted investments is primarily due to a lack of new debt issuances.
(2) $127.6 million decrease in deposit with trustee is primarily due to increased G.O. bond principal payments made compared to fiscal year 2015.

(3) $99.2 million increase in cash and cash equivalents is primarily due to cash collections from the District’s nine campuses as well as increased funding for State Mandate Costs and SSSP.

Deferred outflows of resources increased by $48.2 million. The net increase is due to the following:

(1) $57.3 million increase in deferred outflows of resources caused by changes in the District’s proportionate share of the CalPERS and CalSTRS pension obligation, the District’s contributions after the measurement date and the difference between expected and actual experience in the pension experience.

(2) $9.1 million decrease in deferred outflows of resources is related to the amortization of deferred outflow of resources caused by the G.O. Bonds refunded during the year ended June 30, 2015.

Current liabilities decreased $154.0 million. The net decrease is due in part to a decrease in current portions of long term debt is primarily due to decreased principal payments on 2015 Series A, G and H G.O. bonds compared to prior year.

Noncurrent liabilities increased by $50.1 million. The net increase is due in part to the following:

(1) $121.4 million increase in pension obligations due to changes in actuarially determined pension liabilities.

(2) $14.6 million increase in other post-employment benefit (OPEB) obligations due to changes in actuarially determined pension liabilities.

(3) $85.4 million decrease in the noncurrent portion of long term debt is primarily due to principal payments on the District’s G.O. Bonds.

Deferred inflows of resources decreased by $60.2 million. The net decrease is due to changes in CalPERS and CalSTRS investment earnings, changes in assumptions used, and District proportionate share.

Net position increased by $69.4 million. The net increase is due in part to the following:

(1) $122.4 million increase in net investment in capital assets due to construction activity.

(2) $115.2 million decrease in expendable restricted net position is primarily due to changes in upcoming debt service payment and charges for other special purposes.

(3) $62.1 million increase in unrestricted fund balance is due to net revenue resulting from operational activities.
## LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
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### Summary Schedule of Revenue, Expenses and Change in Net Position

**Years ended June 30, 2016 and 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating revenue:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net tuition and fees</td>
<td>$57,622,035</td>
<td>$57,550,458</td>
<td>71,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and contracts, noncapital</td>
<td>161,153,517</td>
<td>155,213,041</td>
<td>5,940,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>26,613,451</td>
<td>26,002,205</td>
<td>611,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other revenue:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State apportionments, capital</td>
<td>8,297,486</td>
<td>10,843,720</td>
<td>(2,546,234)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal subsidy</td>
<td>19,685,520</td>
<td>19,590,429</td>
<td>95,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local tax for G.O. Bonds</td>
<td>260,049,876</td>
<td>276,208,330</td>
<td>(16,158,454)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonoperating revenue:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State apportionments, noncapital</td>
<td>451,792,207</td>
<td>341,913,554</td>
<td>109,878,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property taxes</td>
<td>199,513,330</td>
<td>182,917,840</td>
<td>16,595,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>4,920,465</td>
<td>4,706,117</td>
<td>214,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal financial aid grants, noncapital</td>
<td>177,696,484</td>
<td>193,739,185</td>
<td>(16,042,701)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State financial aid grants, noncapital</td>
<td>14,692,697</td>
<td>11,424,649</td>
<td>3,268,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28,860,557</td>
<td>14,555,740</td>
<td>14,304,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenue</strong></td>
<td>1,410,897,625</td>
<td>1,294,665,268</td>
<td>116,232,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>481,688,669</td>
<td>436,716,840</td>
<td>44,971,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee benefits</td>
<td>143,122,782</td>
<td>116,109,257</td>
<td>27,013,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensions</td>
<td>48,857,217</td>
<td>34,731,663</td>
<td>14,125,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies, materials, and other operating expenses and services</td>
<td>145,195,888</td>
<td>129,378,004</td>
<td>15,817,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student grants</td>
<td>229,174,652</td>
<td>239,336,739</td>
<td>(10,162,087)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>147,685,580</td>
<td>145,036,149</td>
<td>2,649,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total operating expenses</strong></td>
<td>1,195,724,788</td>
<td>1,101,308,652</td>
<td>94,416,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonoperating expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest expense</td>
<td>144,485,835</td>
<td>115,587,032</td>
<td>28,898,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,322,903</td>
<td>7,198,060</td>
<td>(5,875,157)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenses</strong></td>
<td>1,341,533,526</td>
<td>1,224,093,744</td>
<td>117,439,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in net position</td>
<td>$69,364,099</td>
<td>70,571,524</td>
<td>(1,207,425)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The summary of revenue, expenses, and net position reflects an increase of $69.4 million in net position at the end of the year as explained below.

Operating revenue increased $6.6 million. The net increase is due in part to the following:

1. $2.2 million decrease in noncapital Federal Grants and Contracts primarily due to decrease in funding for Higher Education Act and Vocational Education programs.
2. $25.8 million increase in noncapital State Grants and Contracts primarily due to increase in funding for state programs including SSSP ($20 million), EOP&S ($2 million) and Cal Grant ($3 million).
3. $17.6 million decrease in noncapital Local Grants and Contracts is primarily due to several one-time revenues received during fiscal year 2015. These items include a $5 million grant from Southern California Edison and a $4.3 million legal settlement received.

Nonoperating revenue increased by $128.2 million. The net increase is due in part to the following:

1. $109.9 million increase in State apportionment revenue due to $39 million increase in general apportionment allocation and a one-time $57 million Mandated Cost receipt from the State.
2. $16.6 million increase in Local Property Tax revenue due to increase in LA County property values which increased the basis for taxation.

Other revenue decreased by $18.6 million. The net decrease is due in part to the following:

1. $16.2 million decrease in Local tax for G.O. Bonds related to property taxes levied for District’s debt issuances.
2. $2.5 million decrease in State Apportionment for capital purposes due to revised budget by the state.

---

2016 Revenue by Source

- Operating revenue: $287,475,740
- Nonoperating revenue: $245,389,006
- Other revenue: $288,032,882

---

(Continued)
Operating expenses increased $94.4 million. The net increase is due in part to the following:

1. $45.0 million increase in salary expenses and benefit expense primarily due to adjustments to salaries, as well as hiring of additional full and part-time staff.

2. $27.0 million increase in employee benefits primarily as a result of 88 full-time and 207 part-time personnel, increase in healthcare rates and increase in benefit premiums.

3. $14.1 million increase in pension expenses due to additional actuarially determined pension liabilities.

4. $15.8 million increase in supplies, materials, and other operating expenses due to additional expenses incurred in deferred maintenance as well as professional services related to the District’s PeopleSoft implementation.

5. $10.2 million decrease in student grants expense due to reduction in the number of Federal Financial Aid applications.
Nonoperating expenses increased $23.0 million. The net increase is due in part to the following:

1. $28.9 million increase in interest expense on capital asset due to increase in the interest due on G.O Bonds.

2. $5.9 million decrease in other nonoperating expenses is due to a general apportionment adjustments during FY 2015 that did not occur in FY 2016.
Capital Assets and Debt Administration

Capital Assets

The District’s investment in capital assets as of June 30, 2016 and 2015, totaled $4.29 billion and $4.12 billion, respectively (net of accumulated depreciation). This investment comprises a broad range of capital assets including land, buildings, construction in progress, works of art, infrastructure and land improvement, and furniture and equipment. The following schedules summarize the District’s capital assets as of June 30, 2016 and 2015:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Assets, Net</th>
<th>Balance at June 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>$ 198,750,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land improvements</td>
<td>434,920,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>3,885,768,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction in progress</td>
<td>646,996,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works of art</td>
<td>518,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and equipment</td>
<td>118,769,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>7,127,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,292,849,639</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less accumulated depreciation</strong></td>
<td><strong>(998,472,932)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net capital assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 4,294,376,707</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In fiscal year 2016, the District added $266.5 million of capital assets, capitalized interest of $36.6 million and depreciated $133.6 million of capital assets. During the year ended June 30, 2016, the District’s investments in facility master plans, construction, and building improvements increased due to funding from Proposition A, Proposition AA, and Measure J Bonds. The District had a significant number of ongoing building projects funded from Proposition A, Proposition AA, and Measure J bond money.

In April 2001, the District became the first community college district in the State to pass a property tax financed bond, Proposition A, under the new requirements of the Strict Accountability in Local School Construction Act of 2000. Valued at $1.245 billion, the District’s Proposition A Bond Construction Program stands as one of the largest community college bonds ever passed in California. The bond measure was designed to implement a capital improvement program for each of the nine colleges within the District.

In May 2003, the voters passed another G.O. Bond, Proposition AA, for $980 million. The bond measure was designed to finance construction, building acquisition, equipment, and improvement of college and support facilities at the various campuses of the District and refinance other outstanding debts of the District and colleges.

In November 2008, the voters passed another G.O. Bond, Measure J, for $3.5 billion. The bond measure was designed to finance additional construction, building acquisition, equipment, and improvement of college and support facilities at the various campuses of the District.
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The District is in the fifteenth year of Proposition A, the thirteenth year of Proposition AA, and the eighth year of the Measure J Bond construction programs. Approximately, $4.6 billion has been spent to date for Proposition A, Proposition AA, and Measure J Bonds combined for several capital projects at all nine colleges and to refinance outstanding debt (Certificates of Participation Notes) at both the District and colleges. The District anticipates completion of these capital projects by the year 2020. The District has issued to date all the authorized amounts of Proposition A and Proposition AA Bonds, and $2.225 billion of the Measure J authorization amounts.

Long Term Debt

At June 30, 2016 and 2015, the District had $3.7 billion and $3.9 billion in long-term debt, respectively. The District’s long-term debt decreased during the year ended June 30, 2016, primarily as a result of principal payments made on outstanding G.O. Bonds.

### Summary of Outstanding Long-Term Debt (Related to G.O. Bonds)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>June 30, 2016 and 2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds Proposition A and AA, 2004 Series</td>
<td>$33,670,000</td>
<td>33,670,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds Proposition A, 2005 Series</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>18,140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds Proposition AA, 2006 Series</td>
<td>10,420,000</td>
<td>20,360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds Proposition A, 2007 Series</td>
<td>9,445,000</td>
<td>10,265,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds Proposition A and AA, 2008 Series</td>
<td>40,890,000</td>
<td>51,685,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds Measure J, 2009 Series</td>
<td>75,000,000</td>
<td>75,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds Measure J, 2010 Series</td>
<td>1,200,000,000</td>
<td>1,200,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds Measure J, 2013 Series</td>
<td>213,000,000</td>
<td>216,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds Measure J, 2013 Series Refunding Bond</td>
<td>48,585,000</td>
<td>51,575,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2015 Series G</td>
<td>230,000,000</td>
<td>300,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2015 Series H</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>50,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2015 Refunding Series A</td>
<td>1,462,085,000</td>
<td>1,495,575,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2015 Refunding Series B</td>
<td>42,000,000</td>
<td>47,075,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2015 Refunding Series C</td>
<td>305,905,000</td>
<td>312,420,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$3,671,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,882,265,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The District’s debt rating from Moody’s was Aa1 during June 30, 2016 and 2015. The District’s debt rating from Standard and Poor’s was AA+ in June 30, 2016 and 2015.

Further information regarding the District’s capital assets and long-term debt can be found in notes 6 and 11 in the notes to the accompanying basic financial statements.
Economic Factors

On June 26, 2016, the Governor signed a balanced state budget (SB826/SB828) providing California Community Colleges with an increase in state funding. The 2016-2017 State Adopted Budget of $7.8 billion for California Community Colleges represents a 4% year-over-year funding increase. The budget includes funding to increase access to college by 2%, an increase to base funding of $75 million and $105.5 million of state mandated cost reimbursements to pay down outstanding claims. While the budget did not include any COLA increases, it does provide additional funding for workforce preparation/career and technical education as well as funds for physical plant and instructional support. Funding for the Education Protection Act (EPA) will continue due to the passage of Proposition 55 in November 2016 of which the District received $86 million for the 2016-17 fiscal year. With the improved State economy, the State continues to invest in community colleges with increased funding for student support.

The District Board of Trustees authorized placing a $3.3 billion facilities bond Measure CC titled, the “Affordable Education/Job Training/Classroom Safety Measure” on the November, 2016 ballot that was also passed by the voters in November 2016.

Student Enrollment and State Funding

The student enrollment fee remains at $46 per unit in 2016-17. The State provided 2% or $114.7 million enrollment growth for apportionments for California Community Colleges. The District will receive $10.7 million in enrollment growth revenue for the 2016-17 fiscal year.

The District plans to achieve 2.0% enrollment growth in fiscal year 2016-17.

We are cautioned to keep in mind the required contribution for California Public Employees’ Retirement System and California State Teachers’ Retirement System will increase from $33.3 million for the year ended June 30, 2016 to $70.2 million for the year ended June 30, 2021. These increased contributions will claim a growing share of local operating funds, however, the District has reserved financial resources to fund the increases in these employer contributions through June 30, 2021.

Contacting the District’s Financial Management

This financial report is designed to provide our citizens, taxpayers, students, investors, and creditors with a general overview of the District’s finances and to show the District’s accountability for the money it receives. If you have questions about this report or need any additional financial information, please contact the Chief Financial Officer/Treasurer, Los Angeles Community College District, 770 Wilshire Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90017.
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT  
Statements of Net Position  
June 30, 2016 and 2015  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets and Deferred Outflows of Resources</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current assets:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents (note 3)</td>
<td>$321,082,083</td>
<td>221,922,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable, net of allowance (note 4)</td>
<td>68,342,882</td>
<td>72,117,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student loans receivable, net-current portion (note 4)</td>
<td>198,099</td>
<td>211,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit with trustee – current portion (note 3)</td>
<td>294,481,571</td>
<td>319,114,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory</td>
<td>4,335,850</td>
<td>4,903,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses and other assets</td>
<td>42,185,930</td>
<td>47,149,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total current assets</strong></td>
<td>730,626,415</td>
<td>665,418,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noncurrent assets:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted cash and cash equivalents (note 3)</td>
<td>5,513,958</td>
<td>5,160,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted investments (note 3)</td>
<td>79,508,481</td>
<td>354,360,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student loans receivable, net of allowance – noncurrent portion (note 4)</td>
<td>3,640,149</td>
<td>3,822,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit with trustee – noncurrent portion (note 3)</td>
<td>29,687,434</td>
<td>132,664,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital assets (note 6):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>198,750,248</td>
<td>198,683,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land improvements</td>
<td>434,920,342</td>
<td>427,190,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>3,885,768,325</td>
<td>3,535,360,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction in progress</td>
<td>646,996,098</td>
<td>709,837,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works of art</td>
<td>518,000</td>
<td>518,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture, fixtures, and equipment</td>
<td>118,769,285</td>
<td>111,267,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>7,127,341</td>
<td>7,129,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accumulated depreciation</strong></td>
<td>(998,472,932)</td>
<td>(865,110,227)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital assets, net</strong></td>
<td>4,294,376,707</td>
<td>4,124,877,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td>5,143,353,144</td>
<td>5,286,304,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deferred outflow of resources – pensions (note 8)</strong></td>
<td>92,908,659</td>
<td>35,553,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deferred outflow of resources – debt refunding (note 11)</strong></td>
<td>160,511,781</td>
<td>169,657,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets and deferred outflow of resources</strong></td>
<td>$5,396,773,584</td>
<td>5,491,515,055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Statements of Net Position

June 30, 2016 and 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities, Deferred Inflows of Resources and Net Position</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current liabilities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued liabilities (note 5)</td>
<td>$ 167,576,336</td>
<td>168,972,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unearned revenue</td>
<td>8,432,153</td>
<td>8,924,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensated absences (note 11)</td>
<td>8,811,764</td>
<td>8,238,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General liability (notes 11 and 12)</td>
<td>3,342,989</td>
<td>2,669,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ compensation (notes 11 and 12)</td>
<td>5,052,832</td>
<td>4,965,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued interest and other accrued liabilities</td>
<td>83,198,789</td>
<td>87,717,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amounts held in trust for others</td>
<td>735,489</td>
<td>744,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term debt – current (note 11)</td>
<td>85,411,734</td>
<td>234,341,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital leases – current (note 11)</td>
<td>498,147</td>
<td>476,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total current liabilities</td>
<td>363,060,233</td>
<td>517,051,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncurrent liabilities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensated absences (note 11)</td>
<td>8,862,564</td>
<td>8,089,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General liability (notes 11 and 12)</td>
<td>2,014,011</td>
<td>3,525,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ compensation (notes 11 and 12)</td>
<td>28,763,168</td>
<td>28,082,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension obligations (note 8)</td>
<td>519,790,403</td>
<td>398,421,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net OPEB obligation (note 9)</td>
<td>83,666,179</td>
<td>69,026,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term debt, net of current portion (note 11)</td>
<td>3,930,188,950</td>
<td>4,015,600,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital leases, net of current portion (note 11)</td>
<td>808,436</td>
<td>1,270,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total noncurrent liabilities</td>
<td>4,574,093,711</td>
<td>4,524,016,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total liabilities</td>
<td>4,937,153,944</td>
<td>5,041,067,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred inflow of resources (note 8)</td>
<td>51,732,543</td>
<td>111,924,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total liabilities and deferred inflows</td>
<td>4,988,886,487</td>
<td>5,152,992,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net position:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net investment in capital assets</td>
<td>472,655,914</td>
<td>341,506,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted for:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expendable:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and loans</td>
<td>8,791,115</td>
<td>8,487,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital projects</td>
<td>37,423,819</td>
<td>40,957,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service</td>
<td>232,038,079</td>
<td>365,483,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other special purposes</td>
<td>37,250,989</td>
<td>24,463,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonexpendable:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>(381,272,819)</td>
<td>(443,375,550)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total net position</td>
<td>$ 407,887,097</td>
<td>338,522,998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See accompanying notes to basic financial statements.
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT  
Statements of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Net Position  
Years ended June 30, 2016 and 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating revenues:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and fees</td>
<td>$138,579,713</td>
<td>139,270,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less scholarship discounts and allowances</td>
<td>(80,957,678)</td>
<td>(81,719,976)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net tuition and fees</td>
<td>57,622,035</td>
<td>57,550,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and contracts, noncapital:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>65,161,114</td>
<td>67,340,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>85,206,472</td>
<td>59,446,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>10,785,931</td>
<td>28,425,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net grants and contracts, noncapital</td>
<td>161,153,517</td>
<td>155,213,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary enterprise sales and charges</td>
<td>26,613,451</td>
<td>26,002,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total operating revenue</strong></td>
<td>245,389,003</td>
<td>238,765,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>481,688,669</td>
<td>436,716,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee benefits</td>
<td>143,122,782</td>
<td>116,109,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensions</td>
<td>48,857,217</td>
<td>34,731,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies, materials, and other operating expenses and services</td>
<td>145,195,888</td>
<td>129,378,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student grant</td>
<td>229,174,652</td>
<td>239,336,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>14,091,618</td>
<td>14,890,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>133,593,962</td>
<td>130,146,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total operating expenses</strong></td>
<td>1,195,724,788</td>
<td>1,101,308,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating loss</strong></td>
<td>(950,335,785)</td>
<td>(862,542,948)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonoperating revenues (expenses):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State apportionments, noncapital</td>
<td>451,792,207</td>
<td>341,913,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local property taxes</td>
<td>199,513,330</td>
<td>182,917,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State taxes and other revenue</td>
<td>5,634,165</td>
<td>3,846,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income – noncapital</td>
<td>1,575,877</td>
<td>739,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income – capital</td>
<td>3,344,588</td>
<td>3,966,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest expense on capital asset-related debt</td>
<td>(144,485,835)</td>
<td>(115,587,032)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal financial aid grants, noncapital</td>
<td>177,696,484</td>
<td>193,739,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State financial aid grants, noncapital</td>
<td>14,692,697</td>
<td>11,424,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nonoperating revenue</td>
<td>21,332,782</td>
<td>8,669,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nonoperating expense</td>
<td>(1,322,903)</td>
<td>(7,198,060)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment gain</td>
<td>1,893,610</td>
<td>2,040,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total nonoperating revenues</strong></td>
<td>731,667,002</td>
<td>626,471,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss before other revenues, expenses, gains, or losses</td>
<td>(218,668,783)</td>
<td>(236,070,958)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State apportionments, capital</td>
<td>8,297,486</td>
<td>10,843,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal subsidy</td>
<td>19,685,520</td>
<td>19,590,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local tax for G.O. Bonds</td>
<td>260,049,876</td>
<td>276,208,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase in net position</strong></td>
<td>69,364,099</td>
<td>70,571,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net position:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of year, as previously reported</td>
<td>338,522,998</td>
<td>743,565,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative effect of a change in accounting (note 2)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(475,614,093)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of year, as restated</td>
<td>338,522,998</td>
<td>267,951,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End of year</strong></td>
<td>$407,887,097</td>
<td>338,522,998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See accompanying notes to basic financial statements.
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Statements of Cash Flows

Years ended June 30, 2016 and 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash flows from operating activities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and fees</td>
<td>$57,466,349</td>
<td>53,697,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and contracts</td>
<td>165,303,525</td>
<td>156,760,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to suppliers</td>
<td>(130,449,552)</td>
<td>(132,971,020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments for student grants</td>
<td>(234,725,737)</td>
<td>(239,787,468)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments for utilities</td>
<td>(14,091,618)</td>
<td>(14,890,110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to employees</td>
<td>(478,217,566)</td>
<td>(431,254,657)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments for benefits</td>
<td>(173,590,638)</td>
<td>(142,708,035)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore and cafeteria sales</td>
<td>27,204,406</td>
<td>26,514,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other receipts</td>
<td>188,009</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net cash used in operating activities</strong></td>
<td>(780,912,822)</td>
<td>(724,638,694)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash flows from noncapital financing activities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State apportionments</td>
<td>447,648,680</td>
<td>399,299,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property taxes</td>
<td>199,513,330</td>
<td>182,917,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State taxes and other revenues</td>
<td>5,634,165</td>
<td>3,846,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal financial aid grants</td>
<td>177,696,484</td>
<td>193,739,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State financial aid grants</td>
<td>14,692,697</td>
<td>11,424,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other receipts</td>
<td>6,241,388</td>
<td>1,726,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net cash provided by noncapital financing activities</strong></td>
<td>851,426,744</td>
<td>792,953,669</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash flows from capital financing activities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from capital debt</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>350,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital appropriations, local property tax, grant and gift, capital</td>
<td>9,135,764</td>
<td>17,617,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local tax for G.O. Bond</td>
<td>409,758,383</td>
<td>206,016,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchases of capital assets</td>
<td>(284,725,166)</td>
<td>(264,847,615)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal paid on capital debt and leases</td>
<td>(211,265,000)</td>
<td>(47,175,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest paid on capital debt and leases</td>
<td>(175,885,146)</td>
<td>(161,262,735)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other payments</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(188,009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net cash provided by (used in) capital and related financing activities</strong></td>
<td>(252,981,165)</td>
<td>100,161,219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash flows from investing activities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from sales and maturity of investments</td>
<td>285,701,363</td>
<td>269,190,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on investments</td>
<td>7,128,872</td>
<td>6,471,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of investments</td>
<td>(10,849,493)</td>
<td>(362,088,087)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net cash provided by (used in) investing activities</strong></td>
<td>281,980,742</td>
<td>(86,426,029)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net increase (decrease) in cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>99,513,499</td>
<td>82,050,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents – beginning of the year</td>
<td>227,082,542</td>
<td>145,032,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents – end of year</td>
<td>$326,596,041</td>
<td>227,082,542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT  
Statements of Cash Flows  
Years ended June 30, 2016 and 2015

Reconciliation of operating loss to net cash used in operating activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating loss</td>
<td>$(950,335,782)</td>
<td>$(862,542,948)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments to reconcile operating loss to net cash used in operating activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation expense</td>
<td>133,593,962</td>
<td>130,146,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivables, net</td>
<td>(21,072,544)</td>
<td>(14,152,525)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventories</td>
<td>567,772</td>
<td>169,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other assets</td>
<td>4,963,976</td>
<td>(711,844)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable</td>
<td>12,244,461</td>
<td>12,475,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unearned revenue</td>
<td>24,595,825</td>
<td>2,568,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits held for others</td>
<td>(8,829)</td>
<td>212,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General liability</td>
<td>(838,000)</td>
<td>142,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ compensation</td>
<td>768,000</td>
<td>(83,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensated absences</td>
<td>1,346,035</td>
<td>624,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net OPEB Obligation</td>
<td>14,639,803</td>
<td>5,903,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other liabilities</td>
<td>(1,377,501)</td>
<td>608,414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net cash used by operating activities $ (780,912,822)   (724,638,694)

Noncash capital financing activity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment acquired through new capital lease obligations</td>
<td>$ 35,810</td>
<td>1,334,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions to capital assets, net, included in accounts payable</td>
<td>(17,804,936)</td>
<td>(11,561,896)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of accrued original interest premium</td>
<td>23,076,227</td>
<td>12,488,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of prepaid interest</td>
<td>(9,145,450)</td>
<td>(4,952,365)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See accompanying notes to basic financial statements.
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Notes to Basic Financial Statements
June 30, 2016 and 2015

(1) Organization and Reporting Entity
The Los Angeles Community College District (the District) is a political subdivision of the State of California (the State) and is located within the County of Los Angeles, California (the County). The District’s operations consist principally of providing educational services to the local residents of the District. In conjunction with educational services, the District also provides supporting student services such as the operation of campus bookstores and cafeterias. The District consists of nine community colleges located within the County.

For financial reporting purposes, the District includes all funds that are controlled by or dependent on the District’s board of trustees. The District’s basic financial statements include the financial activities of the District and the totals of the trust and agency funds, which primarily represent Associated Student Organizations and amounts for scholarships within the District. Associated Student Organizations are recognized agencies of the District and were organized in accordance with provisions of the California Education Code to control the administration of student funds. The financial affairs of the Associated Student Organizations are administered under the direction of the college financial administrators at the respective colleges, with the supervision and guidance of the District’s deputy chancellor.

(2) Summary of Significant Accounting Policies
(a) Basis of Presentation
The basic financial statements are reported using the economic resources measurement focus and the accrual basis of accounting. Revenue is recorded when earned and expenses are recorded when a liability is incurred, regardless of the timing of related cash flows.

(b) Financial Reporting
The basic financial statements required by Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) Statement No. 35, Basic Financial Statements – and Management’s Discussion and Analysis – for Public Colleges and Universities – an amendment of GASB Statement No. 34, and Statement No. 34, Basic Financial Statements and Management’s Discussion and Analysis – for State and Local Governments, include a statement of net position; a statement of revenue, expenses, and changes in net position; and a statement of cash flows. The District is considered a special-purpose government under the provisions of GASB Statement No. 35. Accordingly, the District has chosen to present its basic financial statements using the reporting model for special-purpose governments engaged only in business-type activities. This model allows all financial information for the District to be reported in a single column. In accordance with the business-type activities reporting model, the District prepares its statements of cash flows using the direct method. The effect of internal activities between funds or groups of funds has been eliminated from these basic financial statements.

(c) Net Position
The District’s net position is classified into the following categories:

Net Investment in Capital Assets: Capital assets, net of accumulated depreciation and outstanding principal balances of debt attributable to the acquisition, construction, or improvement of those assets.
Restricted Expendable: Subject to externally imposed conditions that can be fulfilled by actions of the District or by the passage of time. Net position may be restricted for such things as capital projects, debt repayment, escrow accounts, and/or educational programs.

Restricted Nonexpendable: Subject to externally imposed conditions where the principal portion of net position is not to be expended for any reason. Only interest earned by the principal portion can be expended on purposes designated by the externally imposed conditions.

Unrestricted: Unrestricted net position is not subject to externally imposed constraints. Unrestricted net position may be designated for specific purposes by action of the board of trustees or may otherwise be limited by contractual agreements with outside parties. When both restricted and unrestricted resources are available for use, it is the District’s practice to use restricted resources first and the unrestricted resources when they are needed.

(d) Cash and Cash Equivalents

The District participates in the common investment pool of the County. The investment pool is reported at fair value. For purposes of the statements of cash flows, the District considers all cash and a portion of the investments pooled with the County plus any other cash deposits or investments with initial maturities of three months or less to be cash and cash equivalents.

(e) Inventory

Bookstore, cafeteria, and supply inventories are recorded at cost on the first-in, first-out basis and expended on the consumption method.

(f) Properties and Depreciation

Properties are carried at cost or at appraised fair market value at the date received in the case of properties acquired by donation, less allowance for accumulated depreciation. Depreciation is computed by use of the straight-line method over the estimated useful lives of the assets.

Current ranges of useful lives for depreciable assets are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Type</th>
<th>Useful Life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land improvements</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>50 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building improvements</td>
<td>20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture, fixtures, and equipment</td>
<td>3 to 7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold improvements</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The District’s capitalization threshold is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Type</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Movable equipment</td>
<td>$ 5,000 and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land, buildings, and infrastructure</td>
<td>50,000 and above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(g) **Accrued Employee Benefits**

The District has reported for vacation leave benefits that have been earned as a liability within the statements of net position. Accumulated sick leave benefits are not reported as liabilities of the District. The District’s policy is to record sick leave as an operating expense in the period taken since such benefits do not vest.

(h) **Unearned Revenue**

A majority of the unearned revenue balance represents cash collected in advance for tuition and student fees and will be recognized as revenue in the period in which it is earned.

(i) **Operating Revenue and Expenses**

The District’s operating revenue includes tuition fees, and federal and state revenue. Operating costs include cost of services as well as materials, contracts, personnel, and depreciation.

Nonoperating revenue includes state apportionments, property taxes, and grants. Property taxes are recognized as revenue in the year for which they are levied. Grants and similar items are recognized as revenue as soon as all eligibility requirements have been met.

(j) **Income Taxes**

The District is a political subdivision of the State and is treated as a governmental entity for tax purposes. As such, the District is generally not subject to federal or state income taxes. However, the District remains subject to income taxes on any net income that is derived from a trade or business regularly carried on and not in furtherance of the purpose for which it was granted exemption. No income tax provision has been recorded as the net income, if any, from any unrelated trade or business, in the opinion of management, is not material to the financial statements taken as a whole.

(k) **Estimates**

The preparation of basic financial statements in conformity with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities, revenue, and expenses in the accompanying basic financial statements. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

(l) **New Accounting Standards**

(i) **Implemented in Fiscal Year 2016**

In December 2015, the GASB issued, and the District adopted the provisions, of Statement No. 79, *Certain External Investment Pools and Pool Participants*, effective for the District’s fiscal year beginning July 1, 2015. Certain provisions on portfolio quality, custodial credit risk, and shadow pricing (paragraphs 18, 19, 23, 26, and 40) are effective for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2017. The portion of the District’s investments recorded at cost is deemed immaterial to these financial statements.
In February 2015, the GASB issued, and the District adopted the provisions, of Statement No. 72, *Fair Value Measurement and Application*, effective for the District’s fiscal year beginning July 1, 2015. This Statement defines fair value and describes how fair value should be measured, what assets and liabilities should be measured at fair value, and what information about fair value should be disclosed in the notes to the financial statements. Refer to footnote 3 for further discussions on the District’s adoption of the provisions of this Standard.

(ii) **Implemented in Future Periods**

In June 2015, the GASB issued Statement No. 75, *Financial Reporting for Postemployment Benefit Plans Other Than Pension Plans*, effective for the District’s fiscal year beginning July 1, 2017. This Statement establishes how government employers should measure, recognize, display, and disclose the long-term obligations and annual costs arising from their promises to provide other postemployment benefits to their retired employees. The District has not yet determined the impact of GASB Statement No. 75 on the District’s financial statements.

In June 2015, the GASB issued Statement No. 76, *The Hierarchy of Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) for State and Local Governments*, effective for the District’s fiscal year beginning July 1, 2015, and should be applied retroactively. This Statement reduces the GAAP hierarchy to two categories of authoritative GAAP and addresses the use of authoritative and nonauthoritative literature in the event that the accounting treatment for a transaction or other event is not specified within a source of authoritative GAAP. This standard did not have a material impact on the District’s financial statements.

In August 2015, the GASB issued Statement No. 77, *Tax Abatement Disclosures*, effective for the District’s fiscal year beginning July 1, 2016. This Statement requires governments that enter into tax abatement agreements to disclose these agreements. The District has not yet determined the impact of GASB Statement No. 76 on the District’s financial statements.

In December 2015, the GASB issued Statement No. 78, *Pensions Provided through Certain Multiple-Employer Defined Benefit Pension Plans*, effective for the District’s fiscal year beginning July 1, 2016. This Statement narrows the scope of GASB Statement No. 68, Accounting and Financial Reporting for Pensions, by excluding pensions provided to employees of state or local governmental employees through cost-sharing multiemployer defined benefit pension plan meeting certain criteria. The District has not yet determined the impact of GASB Statement No. 76 on the District’s financial statements.

In January 2016, the GASB issued Statement No. 80, *Blending Requirements for Certain Component Units*, effective for the District’s fiscal year beginning July 1, 2016. The District deemed its component Units to be insignificant for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016. The District’s component units consist of foundations at each of the District’s 9 colleges as well as the District foundation.
In March 2016, the GASB issued Statement No. 81, *Irrevocable Split-Interest Agreements*, effective for the District’s fiscal year beginning July 1, 2017. The purpose of this statement is to improve accounting and financial reporting by establishing recognition and measurement requirements for irrevocable split-interest agreements. The District has not yet determined the impact of GASB Statement No. 76 on the District’s financial statements.

In March 2016, the GASB issued Statement No. 82, *Pension Issues*, effective for the District’s fiscal year beginning July 1, 2017. The purpose of this statement is to amend GASB Statements 67, 68 and 73 and to improve consistency in the application of pension accounting and financial reporting requirements. The District has not yet determined the impact of GASB Statement No. 82 on the District’s financial statements.

(iii) Previously Implemented GASB Standards

In June 2012, the GASB issued Statement No. 68, *Accounting and Financial Reporting for Pensions*. The District adopted the provisions of the statement effective as of July 1, 2014. Prior to the adoption of Statement No. 68, the District reported pensions under GASB 25, and reported the annual required contribution as a component of employee benefits expense. This statement established standards for measuring and recognizing liabilities, deferred outflows of resources and deferred inflows of resources, and expense/expenditures related to pensions. Statement No. 68 provides requirements for how pension costs and obligations are measured and reported in the basic financial statements. When an organization’s pension liability exceeds the pension plan’s net position available for paying benefits, there is a net pension liability. Governments are now be required to report that amount as a liability in their basic financial statements. In addition, the statement requires that projected benefit payments be discounted to their actuarial present value using a single rate that reflects (1) a long-term expected rate of return on pension plan investments to the extent that the pension plan’s fiduciary net position is projected to be sufficient to pay benefits and pension plan assets are expected to achieve that rate and (2) a tax-exempt, high-quality municipal bond rate to the extent that the conditions under (1) are not met. Implementation of Statement No. 68 resulted in additional pension obligations as well as pension expense, and deferred inflows and outflows of resources. In November 2013, GASB issued Statement No. 71, *Pension Transition for Contributions Made Subsequent to the Measurement Date An Amendment of GASB Statement No. 68*. The statement requires that, at transition to the new accounting standards in accordance with GASB Statement No. 68, a government should recognize a beginning deferred outflow of resources for its pension contributions made after the measurement date of the beginning net pension liability. However, it continues to require that the beginning balances for other deferred outflows and deferred inflows be reported at transition only if it is practical to determine such amounts. The District
adopted the provisions of this statement effective July 1, 2014. As a result, the District has made the following adjustments to restate the net position as of July 1, 2014:

Net position, as previously reported $ 743,565,567

Effects of accounting for adoption of GASB Statements No. 68 and 71:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net pension obligation at beginning of year</td>
<td>(506,673,550)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred outflows related to contributions made after</td>
<td>31,059,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the measurement date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative effect of change in accounting</td>
<td>(475,614,093)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net position, as restated $ 267,951,474

(3) **Cash and Investments**

Cash and investments at June 30, 2016 and 2015 consist of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents in County Treasury</td>
<td>$ 283,661,406</td>
<td>195,606,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash in banks</td>
<td>42,934,635</td>
<td>31,475,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>326,596,041</td>
<td>227,082,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments and deposits with trustee:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments in County Treasury</td>
<td>389,850,061</td>
<td>791,600,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13,827,425</td>
<td>14,539,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total investments and deposits with trustee</td>
<td>403,677,486</td>
<td>806,139,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cash, and investments and deposits with trustee</td>
<td>$ 730,273,527</td>
<td>1,033,222,296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The District uses fair value measurements to record fair value adjustments to certain assets and liabilities and to determine the fair value disclosures. The fair value of a financial instrument is the price that would be received to sell an asset or paid to transfer a liability in an orderly transaction between market participants at the measurement date. Fair value is best determined based upon quoted market prices. However, in certain instances, there are no quoted market prices for the District’s various financial instruments. In cases where quoted market prices are not available, fair values are based on estimates using present value or other valuation techniques. Those techniques are significantly affected by the assumptions used, including discount rates and estimates of future cash flows. Accordingly, the fair value estimates may not be realized in an immediate settlement of the instrument. The District groups its assets and liabilities measured at fair value in three levels, based on the markets in which the assets and liabilities are traded and the reliability of the assumptions used to determine fair value. The three levels of the fair value hierarchy are as follows:

- Level 1 inputs are quoted prices in active markets for identical assets or liabilities that the District has the ability to access at the measurement date.
Level 2 inputs are inputs other than quoted prices included within Level 1 that are observable for the asset or liability, either directly or indirectly.

Level 3 inputs are unobservable inputs for the asset or liability. This valuation is accomplished using management’s best estimate of fair value, with inputs into the determination of fair value that require significant management judgment or estimation. The level in the fair value hierarchy within which a fair measurement in its entirety falls is based on the lowest level input that is significant to the fair value measurement in its entirety.

(a) Cash, cash equivalents and investments in the County Pool

At June 30, 2016 and 2015, the District’s had $637,511,467 and $987,206,828 in cash and cash equivalents and investments in the Los Angeles County Treasurer’s Pool (the County Pool), respectively. The District reports amounts involuntarily invested in the County Pool as cash and cash equivalents as they function as a demand deposit account for the District and can be withdrawn from the pool without notice or penalty. The District reports amounts voluntarily invested in the County Pool (such as unspent bond proceeds and local property tax collected to pay bond principal and interest) as investments given the potential limitations imposed on withdrawals as well as the weighted average life of the County’s Pooled investments.

Statutes authorize the County to invest pooled investments in obligations of the U.S. Treasury, its agencies and municipalities, asset-backed securities, bankers’ acceptances, negotiable certificates of deposit, corporate and depository notes, floating rate notes, commercial paper, shares of beneficial interest, repurchase agreements, reverse repurchase agreements, forwards, futures and options, interest rate swaps, securities lending agreements, and supranationals. The State of California Education Code permits the District to maintain a significant investment in the County Pool for the purpose of increasing interest earnings through the County’s investment activities.

The Los Angeles County Treasurer’s pooled investments are managed by the County Treasurer who reports on a monthly basis to the County Supervisors. In addition, the function of the County Treasurer Oversight Committee is to review and monitor the County’s investment policy. The committee membership includes the Treasurer and Tax Collector, the Auditor Controller, Superintendent of Schools, Chief Administrative Officer, and a non-County representative. To manage the liquidity in the Treasury Pool while still capturing the higher yield offered by longer maturities, the County’s investment guidelines target a portfolio weighted average maturity range between 1.0 and 2.0 years. The weighted average maturity of cash and investments in the County Pool was 1.54 years and 1.63 years at June 30, 2016 and 2015, respectively. To mitigate the risk of securities with longer-term maturities in the investment pool, the Treasurer has limited maturities that exceed one year to 75% of the last three years’ average minimum total cash and investment and requires that no more than 50% of the new issuer limits may be used for periods greater than 180 days. The investments in the Los Angeles Treasurer’s Pool with maturities that exceeded one year represented 46.94% and 45.11% of the total pool at June 30, 2016 and 2015, respectively.
Investments held by the County Treasurer are stated at fair value on a recurring basis as required by GASB Statement No. 72, *Fair Value Measurement an Application*. The fair value of underlying actively traded securities in the pool is determined based on current market prices based on the Citibank Valuation Total Report month-end prices. Underlying securities that are not actively traded are priced in accordance with industry pricing standards and include some unobservable inputs. Bond anticipation notes are reported at cost which equates to fair value. The fair value of the District’s position in the pool is the same as the value of the total pool shares. The method used to determine the value of participants’ equity withdrawn is based on the book value of the participants’ percentage participation at the date of such withdrawals. As the District investment is an external pool with the County, these investments are not required to be leveled in the fair value hierarchy.

**(b) Other Investments**

The District’s other investments at June 30, 2016 and 2015 consist of deposits invested with Bank of New York and nonnegotiable certificates of deposit held by the Associated Student Organizations of each campus of $10,011,213 and $3,816,212 and $10,569,864 and $3,969,728, respectively. The deposits with Bank of New York are reinvested in the County Pool by Bank of New York and accordingly are classified as Level 2 in the fair value hierarchy. Securities such as Commercial Paper and Certificates of Deposit with short maturities and infrequent secondary market trades are typically priced via mathematical calculations and are therefore classified as Level 2 in the fair value hierarchy.

**(c) Fair Value Hierarchy**

The following table summarizes the District’s investments at June 30, 2016 in accordance with the fair value measurement hierarchy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment type</th>
<th>Fair value</th>
<th>Not required to be leveled</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of deposit</td>
<td>$3,816,212</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3,816,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment in the County Pool</td>
<td>399,861,274</td>
<td>389,850,061</td>
<td>10,011,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total investments</strong></td>
<td><strong>$403,677,486</strong></td>
<td><strong>389,850,061</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,827,425</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table summarizes the District’s investments at June 30, 2015 in accordance with the fair value measurement hierarchy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment type</th>
<th>Fair value</th>
<th>Not required to be leveled</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of deposit</td>
<td>$3,969,728</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3,969,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment in the County Pool</td>
<td>802,170,026</td>
<td>791,600,162</td>
<td>10,569,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total investments</strong></td>
<td><strong>$806,139,754</strong></td>
<td><strong>791,600,162</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,539,592</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(4) Accounts, Notes, and Other Receivables

Accounts, notes, and other receivables at June 30, 2016 and 2015 are summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax delinquencies</td>
<td>$5,886,095</td>
<td>12,237,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal and state programs</td>
<td>21,231,910</td>
<td>18,875,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local tax for G.O. Bonds</td>
<td>23,455,429</td>
<td>25,088,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State lottery</td>
<td>11,997,833</td>
<td>8,985,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest receivable</td>
<td>1,383,608</td>
<td>1,698,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable – campus students</td>
<td>10,878,217</td>
<td>11,074,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable – student loan programs</td>
<td>3,838,248</td>
<td>4,033,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore</td>
<td>2,370,338</td>
<td>2,729,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of California – capital outlay</td>
<td>1,628,989</td>
<td>3,448,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2,605,222</td>
<td>7,206,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$85,275,889</td>
<td>95,377,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less allowance for doubtful accounts</strong></td>
<td>(13,094,759)</td>
<td>(19,226,538)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accounts, notes and other receivables, net</strong></td>
<td>$72,181,130</td>
<td>76,150,946</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The allowance for doubtful accounts is maintained at an amount sufficient to reserve the possible uncollectible receivable balances. Tax delinquencies represent prior and current year unpaid/uncollected property taxes that were assessed and billed by the County during the 2015-2016 year and prior. The District receives tax revenue from the County biannually in December and April. Any amounts that remain unpaid and not received by the District within the fiscal year are considered delinquent. The County’s board of supervisors is the taxing authority that levies and collects tax revenue. Other receivables include Federal, State and Local revenues accrued at year end.

(5) Accounts Payable and Accrued Liabilities

Accounts payable at June 30, 2016 and 2015 are summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vendors payable</td>
<td>$55,005,539</td>
<td>48,262,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital outlay and program management</td>
<td>90,851,655</td>
<td>97,872,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll accrual</td>
<td>14,066,158</td>
<td>12,447,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>6,431,526</td>
<td>7,489,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid payable</td>
<td>1,221,458</td>
<td>1,237,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election expense payable</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,663,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$167,576,336</td>
<td>168,972,514</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(6) **Capital Assets**

A summary of changes in capital assets is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Balance at July 1, 2015</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Disposals</th>
<th>Transfers</th>
<th>Balance at June 30, 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital assets not being depreciated:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>$198,683,775</td>
<td>66,473</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$198,750,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction in process</td>
<td>709,837,719</td>
<td>295,298,304</td>
<td>(1,645)</td>
<td>(358,138,280)</td>
<td>646,996,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works of art</td>
<td>518,000</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>518,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total capital assets not being depreciated</strong></td>
<td>909,039,494</td>
<td>295,364,777</td>
<td>(1,645)</td>
<td>(358,138,280)</td>
<td>846,264,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital assets being depreciated:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land improvements</td>
<td>427,190,686</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>434,920,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>3,535,360,374</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(673)</td>
<td>350,408,624</td>
<td>3,885,768,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture, fixtures, and equipment</td>
<td>111,267,723</td>
<td>7,738,560</td>
<td>(236,998)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>118,769,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>7,129,426</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(2,085)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7,127,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total capital assets being depreciated</strong></td>
<td>4,080,948,209</td>
<td>7,738,560</td>
<td>(239,756)</td>
<td>358,138,280</td>
<td>4,446,585,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total capital assets</strong></td>
<td>4,989,987,703</td>
<td>303,103,337</td>
<td>(241,401)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5,292,849,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less accumulated depreciation</td>
<td>(865,110,227)</td>
<td>(133,593,962)</td>
<td>231,257</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(998,472,932)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital assets, net</td>
<td>$4,124,877,476</td>
<td>169,509,375</td>
<td>(10,144)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4,294,376,707</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Notes to Basic Financial Statements
June 30, 2016 and 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Balance at</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Disposals</th>
<th>Transfers</th>
<th>Balance at</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>July 1, 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>June 30, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital assets not being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depreciated:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>$198,683,775</td>
<td>$390,306,642</td>
<td>(1,751,804)</td>
<td>(262,247,007)</td>
<td>$198,683,775</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction in process</td>
<td>$690,306,642</td>
<td>283,529,888</td>
<td>(1,751,804)</td>
<td>(262,247,007)</td>
<td>709,837,719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works of art</td>
<td>$518,000</td>
<td>$334,000</td>
<td>(1,751,804)</td>
<td>(262,247,007)</td>
<td>518,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total capital assets not</td>
<td>$889,508,417</td>
<td>283,529,888</td>
<td>(1,751,804)</td>
<td>(262,247,007)</td>
<td>909,039,494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being depreciated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital assets being</td>
<td>$4,700,560,358</td>
<td>292,056,192</td>
<td>(2,628,847)</td>
<td>(262,247,007)</td>
<td>4,989,987,703</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depreciated:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land improvements</td>
<td>$426,291,708</td>
<td>$321,719,896</td>
<td>(877,043)</td>
<td>(2,292,449)</td>
<td>111,267,723</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>$3,271,719,896</td>
<td>$292,056,192</td>
<td>(2,628,847)</td>
<td>(2,292,449)</td>
<td>3,535,360,374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture, fixtures, and</td>
<td>$103,618,462</td>
<td>$8,526,304</td>
<td>(877,043)</td>
<td>(2,292,449)</td>
<td>7,129,426</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equipment</td>
<td>$9,421,875</td>
<td>$321,719,896</td>
<td>(2,628,847)</td>
<td>(2,292,449)</td>
<td>7,129,426</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>$3,811,051,941</td>
<td>$8,526,304</td>
<td>(877,043)</td>
<td>(2,292,449)</td>
<td>4,080,948,209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total capital assets being</td>
<td>$4,700,560,358</td>
<td>292,056,192</td>
<td>(2,628,847)</td>
<td>(2,292,449)</td>
<td>4,989,987,703</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depreciated:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less accumulated depreciation</td>
<td>$735,511,000</td>
<td>(130,146,039)</td>
<td>$546,812</td>
<td>(865,110,227)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital assets, net</td>
<td>$3,965,049,358</td>
<td>$161,910,153</td>
<td>(2,082,035)</td>
<td>(865,110,227)</td>
<td>4,124,877,476</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Capitalized Interest**

Included in additions to capital assets is $36,623,837 and $37,933,680 of capitalized interest at June 30, 2016 and 2015, respectively.

(7) **Lease Commitments**

The District leases various assets, as lessee, under operating and capital lease agreements. Lease payments under these leases (including month-to-month leases) approximating $6,202,045 and $6,280,890 for the year ended June 30, 2016 and 2015, respectively, have been reported in the accompanying statements of revenue, expenses, and changes in net position.
At June 30, 2016, minimum capital lease commitments under long-term lease contracts were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year ending June 30:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$562,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>458,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>378,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>18,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>1,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,419,349</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(8) **Employee Retirement Systems**

Qualified employees are covered under multiple-employer defined-benefit pension plans maintained by agencies of the State. Certificated employees are members of the California State Teachers’ Retirement System (CalSTRS) and classified employees are members of the California Public Employees’ Retirement System (CalPERS). In addition, certificated employees not participating in the State Teachers’ Defined Benefit Plan may participate in the California State Teachers’ Cash Balance Benefit Program, the Public Agency Retirement Systems (PARS–ARS), or Social Security. On September 2, 2003, the Los Angeles Community College District offered to every adjunct faculty member, who is not a mandatory CalSTRS Defined Benefit Program member, the CalSTRS Cash Balance Benefit Program.

(a) **California State Teachers’ Retirement System (CalSTRS)**

CalSTRS includes full-time certificated employees and hourly adjuncts who permissively elect to participate in CalSTRS, a cost-sharing multiple-employer contributory public employee retirement system defined-benefit pension plan. An actuarial valuation by employer is currently not available. The plan provides retirement and disability benefits, annual cost-of-living adjustments, and death benefits to plan members and beneficiaries.

Employees, who were hired prior to January 1, 2013, attaining the age of 60 with five years of credited California service (service) are eligible for normal retirement and are entitled to a monthly benefit of 2% of their final compensation for each year of service. Final compensation is defined as the highest average salary earned during three consecutive years of service or highest year if member has more than 25 years of CalSTRS Service Credit. The plan permits early retirement options at age 55 or as early as age 50 with 30 years of service. Disability benefits of up to 90% of final compensation are available to members with five years of service. A family benefit is available if the deceased member had at least one year of service and was an active member or on disability leave. After five years of credited service, members become 100% vested in retirement benefits earned to date. If a member’s employment is terminated, only the accumulated member contributions and interest earned on those contributions are refundable.
Under the California Public Employees’ Pension Reform Act of 2013 (AB340), effective January 1, 2013, new CalSTRS members are required to be under a new defined-benefit formula of 2% at age 62. The law establishes a limit on compensation that is counted toward calculating a member’s pension. New CalSTRS members, starting on or after January 1, 2013, who like existing members, are not covered by Social Security; the initial limit is 120% of 2013 Social Security Wages. It also limits postretirement public employment.

In June 2014, the Legislature passed and the governor signed into law, assembly Bill 1469 which establishes a statutory solution to fully fund the CalSTRS Defined Benefit Program.

CalSTRS projected that, even if the investment portfolio could consistently earn its investment return assumption, the fund would still deplete its assets in about 30 years. Thus, assumed market gains in future years would not be sufficient to address such significant losses. A change in the program funding and contribution rates from all parties was required to reach adequate funding.

The initial increases in employee, employer and state contributions took effect July 1, 2014, and will continue to rise incrementally over the next several fiscal years. Member contribution increases will be phased in over the next three years and increase by an additional 2.25% of payroll for CalSTRS 2% at 60 members, and an additional 1.205% for CalSTRS 2% at 62 members.

Employer contributions will increase from 8.25% to a total of 19.1% of payroll, phased in over the next seven years. The state’s total contribution to the Defined Benefit Program as a nonemployer contributing entity will increase incrementally from 3.041% in fiscal year 2013–14 to a total of 6.328% of payroll in fiscal year 2016–17.

Benefit provisions for CalSTRS are established by the State Teachers’ Retirement Law (Part 13 of the California Education Code, Section 22000 et seq.). CalSTRS issues a separate comprehensive annual financial report that includes financial statements and required supplementary information. Copies of the annual financial report may be obtained from the CalSTRS website at http://www.calstrs.com/comprehensive-annual-financial-report.

State Teachers’ Retirement System – Defined Benefit and Cash Balance Benefit Program

On September 2, 2003, Los Angeles Community College District implemented the Cash Balance program and offered it to its adjunct faculty who are not mandatory CalSTRS Defined Benefit Program members. In addition, adjunct faculty have the option of participating in one of the following three retirement plans; CalSTRS Defined Benefit Program, The Public Agency Retirement System (PARS-ARS), or Social Security.

(b) California Public Employees’ Retirement System (CalPERS)

CalPERS includes full-time classified employees and hourly employees who exceed 1,000 hours in a fiscal year participate in CalPERS, a cost-sharing and agent multiple-employer contributory public employee retirement system defined-benefit pension plan that acts as a common investment and administrative agent for participating public entities within the State. The District participates in an agent and cost-sharing pool within CalPERS. An actuarial valuation by employer is not currently
available. One actuarial valuation is performed for those employers participating in the pool and the same contribution rate applies to each.

Employees, who were hired prior to January 1, 2013, are eligible for retirement at the age of 50 with 5 years of service and are entitled to a monthly benefit of 1.1% of final compensation for each year of service credit. The rate is increased if retirement is deferred beyond the age of 50, up to age 63.

The plan also provides death and disability benefits. Retirement benefits fully vest after five years of credited service. Upon separation from the fund, members’ accumulated contributions and interest earned on those funds are refundable through the date of separation.

Under the California Public Employees’ Pension Reform Act of 2013 (AB340), effective January 1, 2013, all new miscellaneous (nonsafety) members will be under a new defined benefit formula of a monthly benefit of 2% of their final compensation at age 62, with an early retirement age of 52 and a maximum benefit factor of 2.5% at age 67. Final compensation means the highest average annual pensionable compensation earned by a member during a period of at least 36 consecutive months, or three school years as applicable.

In addition, the following provisions will apply to new CalPERS members:

- **Pensionable Compensation Cap** – Caps the annual salary that can be used to calculate final compensation for all new School members, at $118,500 (2016 Social Security Contribution and Benefit Base) for employees that participate in Social Security or $140,400 (120% of the 2014 Contribution and Benefit Base) for those employees that do not participate in Social Security. Adjustments to the caps are permitted annually based on changes to the CPI for All Urban Consumers.

- **Equal Sharing of Normal Cost** – For schools employers a new member’s initial contribution rate will be at least 50% of the total normal cost rate or the current contribution rate of similarly situated employees, whichever is greater. (Currently PEPRA members contribute 6% and Non PEPRA Members 7%).

- **The initial increases in employee, employer and state contributions took effect July 1, 2014, and will continue to rise incrementally over the next several fiscal years. Member contribution increases will be phased in over the next three years and increase by an additional 2.25% of payroll for CalSTRS 2% at 60 members, and an additional 1.205% for CalSTRS 2% at 62 members.**

- **Employer contributions will increase from 8.25% to a total of 19.1% of payroll, phased in over the next seven years. The state’s total contribution to the Defined Benefit Program as a nonemployer contributing entity will increase incrementally from 3.041% in fiscal year 2013–14 to a total of 6.328% of payroll in fiscal year 2016–17.**

The new Pension Reform also prohibits the purchase of nonqualified service credit on or after January 1, 2013 and limits post retirement public employment. CalPERS retirees cannot serve, be employed by or be employed through a contract directly by CalPERS employer unless he or she reinstates.
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Benefit provisions for CalPERS are established by the Public Employees’ Retirement Law (Part 3 of the California Government Code, Section. 20000 et seq.). CalPERS issues a separate comprehensive annual financial report that includes financial statements and required supplementary information. Copies of the annual financial report may be obtained from the CalPERS website at https://www.calpers.ca.gov/page/forms-publications.

Public Agency Retirement System – Alternate Retirement System (PARS-ARS)

The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 (Section 11332) extends the Social Security tax to state and local government employees not participating in a qualified public retirement system. Internal Revenue Code 3121(b)(7)(F) proposed regulations allow employers to establish an alternative retirement system in lieu of Social Security taxes. Such an alternative system was authorized on June 26, 1991 to be established by the end of calendar year 1991 for certain employees not participating in CalSTRS or CalPERS.

On December 4, 1991, the District’s board of trustees adopted PARS-ARS, a defined-contribution plan qualifying under Sections 401(a) and 501 of the Internal Revenue Code, effective January 1, 1992, for the benefit of employees not participating in CalSTRS or CalPERS who were employed on that date or hired thereafter. The District has appointed Phase 11 Systems, in which Imperial Trust Company serves as the trustee, to manage the assets of the PARS-ARS plan and serve as the Trust Administrator.

Total contributions to PARS-ARS are 7.50%. The employer contribution is 4.00% and the employee contribution is 3.50%. Contributions are vested 100.00% for employees. Employees can receive their funds after 24 months if they change retirement plans, when they retire, become disabled, or terminate employment. If they die, their beneficiary(s) then get the employee’s funds.

(c) Pension Liabilities, Pension Expense, and Deferred Outflows of Resources and Deferred Inflows of Resources Related to Pensions

As of June 30, 2016, the District reported an aggregate liability of $519,790,402 for its proportionate share of the CalPERS and CalSTRS net pension liabilities. The net pension liabilities were measured as of June 30, 2015, and the total pension liabilities used to calculate the net pension liabilities were determined based on actuarial valuations as of June 30, 2014. The District’s proportion of the CalPERS and CalSTRS net pension liability was calculated based on its proportionate share of total employer contributions to CalPERS and CalSTRS of 1.2381% and 0.5010%, respectively.
For the year ended June 30, 2016, the District recognized an aggregate pension expense of $48,857,217 which included amortization of $27,981,149 of deferred inflows of resources. At June 30, 2016 and 2015, the District reported aggregate deferred outflows of and deferred inflows of resources related to pensions from the following sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>June 30, 2016</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>June 30, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CalPERS</td>
<td>CalSTRS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deferred</td>
<td>deferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outflows of</td>
<td>outflows of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>resources</td>
<td>resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District retirement</td>
<td>$19,133,361</td>
<td>25,901,747</td>
<td>45,035,108</td>
<td>$16,386,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subsequent to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measurement date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between</td>
<td>10,429,982</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10,429,982</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and actual experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in the District's proportionate share</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37,443,569</td>
<td>37,443,569</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total deferred</td>
<td>$29,563,343</td>
<td>63,345,316</td>
<td>92,908,659</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outflows of resources-pensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>June 30, 2016</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>June 30, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CalPERS</td>
<td>CalSTRS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deferred</td>
<td>deferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outflows of</td>
<td>outflows of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>resources</td>
<td>resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in</td>
<td>$11,213,133</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11,213,133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assumptions used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net difference</td>
<td>6,248,858</td>
<td>33,131,130</td>
<td>39,379,988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between projected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and actual earnings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on pension plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in the</td>
<td>1,139,422</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,139,422</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District’s proportionate share</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total deferred</td>
<td>$18,601,413</td>
<td>33,131,130</td>
<td>51,732,543</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inflows of resources-pensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
The deferred outflows of resources related to pension resulting from the District’s contributions subsequent to the measurement date will be recognized as a reduction of the net pension liability in the year ended June 30, 2017. The deferred inflows of resources related to the net difference between projected and actual earnings on pension plan investments will be recognized in pension expense during the next five years and thereafter as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year ending June 30:</th>
<th>Deferred inflows of resources</th>
<th>Deferred outflows of resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$21,158,953</td>
<td>9,837,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>21,158,953</td>
<td>9,837,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>20,733,003</td>
<td>9,477,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>(13,197,547)</td>
<td>6,240,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>939,017</td>
<td>6,240,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thereafter</td>
<td>940,164</td>
<td>6,240,596</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) Contributions Required and Contributions Made

For fiscal year 2015-16, the District was required by statute to contribute 10.73%, 11.847%, 4.00%, and 4.00% of gross salary expenditures to STRS, PERS (pooled), Cash Balance, and PARS, respectively. Participants are required to contribute 9.20%, 7.00%, 4.00%, and 3.50% of gross salary to STRS, PERS, Cash Balance, and PARS, respectively, for the year ended June 30, 2016. CalPERS participants who were hired prior to January 1, 2013 are required to contribute 7% of gross salary to CalPERS, and CalPERS participants who were hired on or after January 1, 2013 are required to contribute 6% of gross salary to CalPERS in fiscal year 2015-16. As of June 30, 2016, 74.00% and 79.43% of the District’s net pension liabilities for CalSTRS and CalPERS are funded, respectively.
The District’s contributions for the years ended June 30, 2016, 2015, and 2014 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributions</th>
<th>Percentage of required contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$ 25,901,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>19,166,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>16,622,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$ 19,133,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>16,386,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>15,345,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Balance STRS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$ 1,977,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,848,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,505,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARS-ARS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$ 669,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>569,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>507,388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The District’s employer contributions to STRS, PERS, Cash Balance, and PARS-ARS met the required contribution rate established by law.

(e) Actuarial Methods and Assumptions

The actuarial valuations involve the use of estimates of the value of reported amounts and assumptions about the probability of events far into the future, and actuarially determined amounts are subject to continual revision as actual results are compared to past expectations and new estimates are made about the future. The actuarial calculations are based on the types of benefits provided and the pattern of cost sharing between the District and plan members at the time of each valuation. The projection of these benefits is for financial reporting purposes only and does not explicitly incorporate the potential effects of legal or contractual funding limitations on the pattern of cost sharing between the District and plan members in the future.
The total pension liability was determined using the following actuarial assumptions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CalSTRS</th>
<th>CalPERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measurement date</td>
<td>June 30, 2015</td>
<td>June 30, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuation date</td>
<td>June 30, 2014</td>
<td>June 30, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuarial assumptions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount rate</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll growth</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected salary increase</td>
<td>Varies by entry age and service</td>
<td>Varies by entry age and service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment rate of return</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CalSTRS</th>
<th>CalPERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measurement date</td>
<td>June 30, 2014</td>
<td>June 30, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuation date</td>
<td>June 30, 2013</td>
<td>June 30, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuarial assumptions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount rate</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll growth</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected salary increase</td>
<td>Varies by entry age and service</td>
<td>Varies by entry age and service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment rate of return</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(f) Mortality Assumptions

**CalSTRS**

The mortality assumptions are based on custom mortality tables to best fit the patterns of mortality among its members. These custom tables are based on RP2000 series tables adjusted to fit CalSTRS experience. RP2000 series tables are an industry standard set of mortality rates published by the Society of Actuaries. See CalSTRS July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2010 Experience Analysis for more information, available on the CalSTRS website.

**CalPERS**

The mortality assumptions are based on mortality rates resulting from the most recent CalPERS Experience Study adopted by the CalPERS Board, first used in the June 30, 2013 valuation. For purposes of the post-retirement mortality rates, the revised rates include 20 years of projected on-going mortality improvements using Scale BB published by the Society of Actuaries. Further details of the Experience Study can be found on the CalPERS website.
(g) **Discount Rate**

*CalSTRS*

An analysis of future cash flows including contributions, investment returns, administrative expenses, and benefit payments was performed by a CalSTRS external actuary. The actuary determined that CalSTRS assets will be sufficient to pay all future benefit payments. Therefore, a blended discount rate was not used to calculate the NPL at June 30, 2015 and the assumed investment rate of return, gross of administrative expenses, 7.5%, was used to discount all future benefits.

According to Paragraph 30 of Statement 68, the long-term discount rate should be determined without reduction for pension plan administrative expense. The 7.5% investment return assumption used in this accounting valuation is net of administrative expenses. Administrative expenses are assumed to be 10 basis points. An investment return excluding administrative expenses would have been 7.60%. Using this lower discount rate has resulted in a slightly higher total pension liability and net pension liability.

The long-term expected rate of return on pension plan investments was determined using a building-block method in which best-estimate ranges of expected future real rates of return (expected returns, net of pension plan investment expense and inflation) are developed for each major asset class.

*CalPERS*

To determine whether the municipal bond rate should be used in the calculation of a discount rate for each plan, CalPERS stress tested plans that would most likely result in a discount rate that would be different from the actuarially assumed discount rate. Based on the testing, none of the tested plans run out of assets. Therefore, the current 7.65% discount rate is adequate and the use of the municipal bond rate calculation is not necessary. The stress test results are presented in a detailed report that can be obtained from the CalPERS website.

According to Paragraph 30 of Statement 68, the long-term discount rate should be determined without reduction for pension plan administrative expense. The 7.65% investment return assumption used in this accounting valuation is gross of administrative expenses. The discount rate used for the measurement period ending June 30, 2014 was 7.5% which was net of administrative expenses. This change in assumptions resulted in a deferred inflow for the district of $11,213,133. This inflow will be recognized in pension expense over the next seven years.
The long-term expected rate of return on pension plan investments was determined using a building-block method in which best-estimate ranges of expected future real rates of return (expected returns, net of pension plan investment expense and inflation) are developed for each major asset class.

Sensitivity of the Net Pension Liability to Changes in the Discount Rate

The following presents the net pension liability of the District for each Plan, calculated using the discount rate for each Plan, as well as what the District’s net pension liability would be if it were calculated using a discount rate that is 1-percentage point lower or 1-percentage point higher than the current rate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CalSTRS</th>
<th>CalPERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1% decrease</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net pension liability</td>
<td>509,286,540</td>
<td>297,029,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current discount rate</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net pension liability</td>
<td>337,293,240</td>
<td>182,497,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% increase</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net pension liability</td>
<td>194,352,930</td>
<td>87,256,007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(h) Rate of Return**

The tables below reflect the long-term expected real rate of return by asset class. The rate of return was calculated using the capital market assumptions applied to determine the discount rate and asset allocation. These rates of return are net of administrative expenses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CalSTRS – Asset class:</th>
<th>New strategic allocations</th>
<th>Long-term rate of return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global equity</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed income</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private equity</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation sensitive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CalPERS – Asset class:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Allocation</th>
<th>Rate of Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global equity</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global fixed income</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation sensitive</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private equity</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquidity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(9) Other Postemployment Benefits (OPEB)

The District provides postemployment healthcare benefits for eligible employees who retire with CalPERS or CalSTRS pension benefits immediately upon termination of employment from the District through the Los Angeles Community College District Postretirement Health Benefits Plan (the Plan). The Plan is a single employer OPEB plan, and obligations of the plan members and the District are based on negotiated contracts with the various bargaining units of the District. The District follows the reporting requirements of GASB Statement No. 45, Accounting and Financial Reporting by Employers for Postemployment Benefits Other Than Pensions.

(a) Plan Description

Retirees receiving a pension from either CalSTRS or CalPERS are eligible for benefits depending on their most recent date of hire and their benefit eligibility service. The District pays a percentage of the eligible retirees’ medical, dental, and vision plan premiums as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Service</th>
<th>Premium paid by district</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 2/11/1992</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 2/11/1992 and 6/30/1998</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On or after 7/1/1998</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On or after 7/1/1998</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On or after 7/1/1998</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The retirement eligibility for CalPERS retirees is a minimum age of 50 and minimum years of service of 5. The retirement eligibility for CalSTRS retirees is a minimum age of 55 and minimum years of service of 5 or a minimum age of 50 with 30 years of service.
Employees subject to a 2001 agreement between the District and the District’s Police Officer’s Association may be eligible to receive benefits through Los Angeles County Employees Retirement Association (LACERA) that are paid by the District. Such eligible retirees shall receive medical, dental, and vision benefits. The District pays 100% of LACERA’s premiums reduced by 4% for each year of service under LACERA up to 25 years. This reduction only applies to employees with more than 10 years of service under LACERA.

Employees that are not eligible for District paid contributions are still eligible for retiree coverage under California Assembly Bill 528 (AB528). At retirement, such retirees must pay for coverage at a rate based on blended active and retiree costs. As of the latest actuarial study, AB528 retiree contributions are expected to cover all costs; and, accordingly, no liabilities are calculated.

The retirement health benefit continues for the lifetime of a surviving spouse and for other dependents as long as they are entitled to coverage under pertinent eligibility rules.

Currently, the District has about 4,100 active employees who are eligible for postretirement health benefits and about 3,200 retirees and surviving spouses who receive postretirement health benefits.

(b) Actuarial Methods and Assumptions

The actuarial valuations involve the use of estimates of the value of reported amounts and assumptions about the probability of events far into the future, and actuarially determined amounts are subject to continual revision as actual results are compared to past expectations and new estimates are made about the future. The actuarial calculations are based on the types of benefits provided and the pattern of cost sharing between the District and plan members at the time of each valuation. The projection of these benefits is for financial reporting purposes only and does not explicitly incorporate the potential effects of legal or contractual funding limitations on the pattern of cost sharing between the District and plan members in the future.

Projections of benefits for financial reporting purposes are based on the substantive plan (the Plan as understood by the employer and the plan members) and include the types of benefits provided at the time of each valuation and the historical pattern of sharing benefit costs between the employer and plan members. The actuarial methods and assumptions used include techniques that are designed to reduce the effects of short-term volatility in actuarial accrued liabilities, and the actuarial value of assets consistent with the long-term perspective of the calculations.

In the July 1, 2015 actuarial valuation, the entry age normal cost method with an open 30-year amortization period as a level percent of pay was used as the cost method to calculate for the annual required contribution (ARC). The actuarial assumptions included a 5.60% blended discount rate based on the assumed long-term return on plan assets and employer assets. A 3.00% wage inflation assumption was used as well as an annual pre-Medicare medical trend rate, Medicare medical trend rate , and dental/vision trend rate of 7.00%, 8.40%, and 4.00%, respectively, initially, reduced by decrements to an ultimate rate of 5.00%, 5.00%, and 4.00%, respectively through at least 2024.
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(c) Funding Policy

The contribution requirements are established and may be amended by the District and the District’s bargaining units. The required contribution is based on projected pay as you go financing requirements. Additionally, the District’s board of trustees adopted a resolution dated April 23, 2008 (com No. BF2) to establish an irrevocable trust with CalPERS to prefund a portion of retiree health benefit costs.

The trust is to be funded with annual contributions by the District of approximately 1.92% of the total full-time salary expenditures in the District. The District deposited $5,597,042 and $7,397,472 to the irrevocable trust with CalPERS during FY2016 and FY2015, respectively.

(d) Annual OPEB Costs and Net OPEB Obligation

The District’s annual OPEB cost (expense) is calculated based on the annual required contribution of the employer (ARC), an amount actuarially determined in accordance with GASB Statement No. 45. The ARC represents a level of funding that, if paid on an ongoing basis, is projected to cover normal cost each year and amortize any Unfunded Actuarial Accrued Liability (UAAL) over a period of 30 years. The following table shows the components of the District’s OPEB cost for the year, the amount actually contributed to the Plan, and changes in the District’s net OPEB obligation to the Plan for the years ended June 30:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual required contribution</td>
<td>$42,591,000</td>
<td>$34,604,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on net OPEB obligation</td>
<td>3,865,000</td>
<td>4,343,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment to annual required contribution</td>
<td>(3,309,000)</td>
<td>(3,439,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual OPEB cost</td>
<td>43,147,000</td>
<td>35,508,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions made</td>
<td>(28,507,197)</td>
<td>(29,604,235)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in net OPEB obligation</td>
<td>14,639,803</td>
<td>5,903,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net OPEB obligation, beginning of year</td>
<td>69,026,376</td>
<td>63,122,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net OPEB obligation, end of year</td>
<td>$83,666,179</td>
<td>69,026,376</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The District’s annual OPEB cost, the percentage of annual OPEB cost contributed to the Plan, and the net OPEB obligation are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal year ended</th>
<th>Annual OPEB costs</th>
<th>Actual Contributions</th>
<th>Percentage of annual OPEB costs contributed</th>
<th>Net OPEB obligation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 2016</td>
<td>$43,147,000</td>
<td>28,507,196</td>
<td>66.07%</td>
<td>$83,666,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 2015</td>
<td>35,508,000</td>
<td>29,604,235</td>
<td>83.37</td>
<td>69,026,376</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(e) Funded Status Information

The District’s funding status information is as follows (dollars in thousands (000s omitted)):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actuarial valuation date</th>
<th>Actuarial value of assets</th>
<th>Actuarial accrued liability (AAL)</th>
<th>Unfunded AAL (UAAL)</th>
<th>Funded ratio</th>
<th>Covered payroll</th>
<th>UAAL as a percentage of covered payroll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 1, 2015</td>
<td>$ 76,791</td>
<td>644,738</td>
<td>567,947</td>
<td>11.91%</td>
<td>$ 286,856</td>
<td>198.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1, 2013</td>
<td>51,823</td>
<td>478,320</td>
<td>426,497</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>155.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of June 30, 2016 and 2015, the District has set aside approximately $62.9 million and $57.3 million, respectively, in an external trust fund. The fair value of the trust fund as of June 30, 2016 and 2015 was approximately $83.4 million and $76.8 million, respectively. Refer to schedule of other postemployment benefit funding progress in Required Supplemental Information on page 45.

(f) Other Benefits

Effective January 1, 2010, the District provided an annual contribution of $1,500 to benefited active employees and pre-Medicare retirees into a health reimbursement account (HRA) for the next five years. Contributions made by the District are $6.0 million and $6.0 million for the fiscal years ended June 30, 2016 and 2015, respectively. This benefit was approved by the Board of Trustee’s on November 19, 2014 for a two year extension. This HRA is assumed to sunset on December 31, 2016 with no future contributions after this date for this July 1, 2015 actuarial valuation.

(10) Commitments and Contingencies

The District receives a substantial portion of its total revenue under various governmental grants, all of which pay the District based on reimbursable costs as defined by each grant. Reimbursement recorded under these grants is subject to audit by the grantors. Management believes that no material adjustments will result from the subsequent audit of costs reflected in the accompanying basic financial statements.

The District is a defendant in various lawsuits at June 30, 2016. Although the outcome of these lawsuits is not presently determinable, in the opinion of management, based in part on the advice of counsel, the resolution of these matters will not have a material adverse effect on the basic financial condition of the District or is adequately covered by insurance.

The District has entered into various contracts for the construction of facilities throughout the campuses. At June 30, 2016, the total value of these outstanding commitments is $473,112,222.
Long-Term Liabilities

The following is a summary of long-term liabilities of the District for the years ended June 30, 2016 and 2015:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Balance at July 1, 2015</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Deletions</th>
<th>Balance at June 30, 2016</th>
<th>Due within one year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2004 Series A and B</td>
<td>$33,670,000</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$33,670,000</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2005 Series A</td>
<td>18,140,000</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(18,140,000)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2006 Series E</td>
<td>20,360,000</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(9,940,000)</td>
<td>10,420,000</td>
<td>10,420,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2007 Series A</td>
<td>10,265,000</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(820,000)</td>
<td>9,445,000</td>
<td>4,565,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2008 Series E1 and F1</td>
<td>51,685,000</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(10,795,000)</td>
<td>40,890,000</td>
<td>12,130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2009 Series A and B</td>
<td>75,000,000</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>75,000,000</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2010 Series C, D, and E</td>
<td>1,200,000,000</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,200,000,000</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2013 Series F</td>
<td>216,500,000</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(3,500,000)</td>
<td>213,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2013 Refunding Bond</td>
<td>51,575,000</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(2,990,000)</td>
<td>48,585,000</td>
<td>3,080,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2015 Series G</td>
<td>300,000,000</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(70,000,000)</td>
<td>230,000,000</td>
<td>5,840,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2015 Series H</td>
<td>50,000,000</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(50,000,000)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2015 Refunding Series A</td>
<td>1,495,575,000</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(33,490,000)</td>
<td>1,462,085,000</td>
<td>2,785,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2015 Refunding Series B</td>
<td>47,075,000</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(5,075,000)</td>
<td>42,000,000</td>
<td>4,345,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2015 Refunding Series C</td>
<td>312,420,000</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(6,515,000)</td>
<td>305,905,000</td>
<td>15,950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unamortized bond premiums</td>
<td>367,676,912</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(23,076,231)</td>
<td>344,600,681</td>
<td>22,296,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ compensation claims</td>
<td>33,048,000</td>
<td>5,820,832</td>
<td>(5,052,832)</td>
<td>33,816,000</td>
<td>5,052,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General liability</td>
<td>6,195,000</td>
<td>2,504,989</td>
<td>(3,342,989)</td>
<td>5,357,000</td>
<td>3,342,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensated absences</td>
<td>16,328,293</td>
<td>1,346,035</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>17,674,328</td>
<td>8,811,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital lease obligations</td>
<td>1,747,313</td>
<td>35,810</td>
<td>(476,540)</td>
<td>1,306,583</td>
<td>498,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,307,260,518</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,707,666</strong></td>
<td><strong>(243,213,592)</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,073,754,592</strong></td>
<td><strong>103,117,466</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(a) General Obligation Bonds

The voters has passed 3 General Obligation (G.O.) Bond measures which were designed to finance construction, building and equipment acquisition, capital improvement programs for each of the nine colleges and the Educational Service Center and refinance other outstanding debts. On April 10, 2001, the voters of the County passed Proposition A, a $1.2 billion G.O. Bond measure. On May 20, 2003, the voters of the County passed Proposition AA, a $980 million G.O. Bond measure. On November 4, 2008, the voters of the County passed Measure J, a $3.5 billion G.O. Bond measure.

The District has issued to date all the authorized amounts of Proposition A and Proposition AA, and $2.225 billion of Measure J. The G.O. Bond measures were issued with interest ranging from 2% to 7.53%. The effective interest rate at the financial statement date is 4.96%.

On November 8, 2016, the voters of the County passed Measure CC, a $3.3 billion G.O. Bond Measure. The District has not issued any bonds authorized by Measure CC. Issuance of bonds against these bonds will begin in fiscal year 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bond Description</th>
<th>Balance at July 1, 2014</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Deletions</th>
<th>Balance at June 30, 2015</th>
<th>Due within one year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2004 Series A and B</td>
<td>83,085,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>(49,415,000)</td>
<td>33,670,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2005 Series A</td>
<td>403,320,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>(385,180,000)</td>
<td>18,140,000</td>
<td>18,140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2006 Series E</td>
<td>266,185,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>(245,825,000)</td>
<td>20,360,000</td>
<td>9,940,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2007 Series A</td>
<td>381,585,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>(371,320,000)</td>
<td>10,265,000</td>
<td>820,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2008 Series E1 and F1</td>
<td>608,905,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>(557,220,000)</td>
<td>51,685,000</td>
<td>10,795,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2009 Series A and B</td>
<td>425,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>(350,000,000)</td>
<td>75,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2010 Series C, D, and E</td>
<td>1,200,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3,500,000)</td>
<td>216,500,000</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2013 Series F</td>
<td>220,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,905,000)</td>
<td>51,575,000</td>
<td>2,990,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2013 Refunding Bond</td>
<td>54,480,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>(300,000,000)</td>
<td>50,000,000</td>
<td>50,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2015 Series G</td>
<td>300,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>300,000,000</td>
<td>300,000,000</td>
<td>70,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2015 Series H</td>
<td>50,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000,000</td>
<td>50,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2015 Refunding Series A</td>
<td>1,495,575,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,495,575,000</td>
<td>1,495,575,000</td>
<td>33,490,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2015 Refunding Series B</td>
<td>47,075,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>47,075,000</td>
<td>47,075,000</td>
<td>5,075,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds 2015 Refunding Series C</td>
<td>312,420,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>312,420,000</td>
<td>312,420,000</td>
<td>6,515,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers' compensation claims</td>
<td>33,131,000</td>
<td>4,882,682</td>
<td>(4,965,682)</td>
<td>33,048,000</td>
<td>4,965,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General liability</td>
<td>6,053,000</td>
<td>2,811,674</td>
<td>(2,669,674)</td>
<td>6,195,000</td>
<td>2,669,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensated absences</td>
<td>15,703,474</td>
<td>624,819</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,328,293</td>
<td>8,238,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital lease obligations</td>
<td>910,520</td>
<td>1,334,555</td>
<td>(497,762)</td>
<td>1,747,313</td>
<td>476,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,811,949,073</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,548,118,917</strong></td>
<td><strong>(2,052,807,472)</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,307,260,518</strong></td>
<td><strong>250,691,726</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Notes to Basic Financial Statements
June 30, 2016 and 2015

The deferred outflows of resources related to the G.O. Bonds Refunded Bonds will be recognized in interest expense on capital asset-related debt over the life of the refunded bonds as follows:

June 30:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$9,145,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$9,145,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$9,145,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$9,145,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$9,145,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thereafter</td>
<td>$114,784,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$160,511,781</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Debt service requirements to maturity of the G.O. Bonds at June 30, 2016 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s) ending June 30:</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$63,115,000</td>
<td>$193,556,459</td>
<td>$256,671,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$66,530,000</td>
<td>$190,825,580</td>
<td>$257,355,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$69,255,000</td>
<td>$187,797,190</td>
<td>$257,052,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$73,785,000</td>
<td>$184,515,700</td>
<td>$258,300,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$81,320,000</td>
<td>$180,810,979</td>
<td>$262,130,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022-2026</td>
<td>$567,290,000</td>
<td>$835,963,907</td>
<td>$1,403,253,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027-2031</td>
<td>$771,665,000</td>
<td>$665,388,067</td>
<td>$1,437,053,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032-2036</td>
<td>$763,180,000</td>
<td>$452,220,704</td>
<td>$1,215,400,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2037-2041</td>
<td>$427,215,000</td>
<td>$321,060,097</td>
<td>$748,275,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2042-2046</td>
<td>$399,030,000</td>
<td>$200,643,049</td>
<td>$599,673,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2047-2050</td>
<td>$388,615,000</td>
<td>$53,902,294</td>
<td>$442,517,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$3,671,000,000</td>
<td>$3,466,684,026</td>
<td>$7,137,684,026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The county of Los Angeles levies property taxes in order to make G.O. Bond principal and interest payments on behalf of the District.
(b) Lease Purchase Financing

Debt service requirements to maturity of the lease purchase financing transactions at June 30, 2016 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s) ending June 30:</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$498,147</td>
<td>64,508</td>
<td>562,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>423,274</td>
<td>35,541</td>
<td>458,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>366,118</td>
<td>12,060</td>
<td>378,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>17,848</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>18,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,306,583</td>
<td>112,766</td>
<td>1,419,349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Notes to Basic Financial Statements
June 30, 2016 and 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Balance at July 1, 2014</th>
<th>Current year claims and changes in estimates</th>
<th>Claim payments</th>
<th>Balance at June 30, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ compensation</td>
<td>$33,131,000</td>
<td>4,882,682</td>
<td>(4,965,682)</td>
<td>33,048,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General liability</td>
<td>6,053,000</td>
<td>2,811,674</td>
<td>(2,669,674)</td>
<td>6,195,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the years ended June 30, 2016 and 2015, the District made total premium payments of approximately $3,281,564 and $3,467,274, respectively, for general liability and property claims.

(13) Subsequent Events

The District evaluated events or transactions that occurred subsequent to the statements of net position date through December 7, 2016, the date the accompanying financial statements were available to be issued.

During FY2017, the District issued new Measure J G.O. Bond Series I for a total of $300,000,000. The District also issued 2016 G.O. Refunding Bonds for a total of $177,745,000 to fully refund $175,000,000 of the Measure J G.O. Bond 2010 Series C. The refunding resulted in an accounting loss of $23,206,383 which will be recorded as a deferred outflow and will be recognized over the life of the refunded bonds. The aggregate debt service decreased by $41,849,967 thereby resulting in an economic gain of $28,818,005.

The Board of Trustees authorized placing a $3.3B facilities bond, Measure CC on the November 2016 ballot that was passed by the voters on November 8, 2016. The proceeds from these bonds will be used to construct and improve much-needed facilities throughout the nine colleges in the District in order to remain competitive in preparing students for university transfer and jobs in high demand industries.
REQUIRED SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Schedule of Other Postemployment Benefits (OPEB) Funding Progress and Employer Contributions
Year ended June 30, 2016
(Unaudited)

Schedule of funding progress:
The following schedule of funding progress, presented as required supplementary information, follows the notes to the financial statements and presents multiyear trend information about whether the actuarial value of plan assets is increasing or decreasing over time relative to the actuarial accrued liabilities for benefits.

The District funding progress information is illustrated as follows (amounts in thousands):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actuarial valuation date</th>
<th>Actuarial value of assets</th>
<th>Actuarial accrued liability (AAL)</th>
<th>Unfunded AAL (UAAL)</th>
<th>Funded ratio</th>
<th>Covered payroll</th>
<th>UAAL as a percentage of covered payroll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 1, 2015</td>
<td>$ 76,791</td>
<td>644,738</td>
<td>567,947</td>
<td>11.91%</td>
<td>$286,856</td>
<td>197.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1, 2013</td>
<td>51,823</td>
<td>478,320</td>
<td>426,497</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>155.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District contributions made:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal year</th>
<th>Contributions made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year 2016</td>
<td>$28,507,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year 2015</td>
<td>29,604,235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Schedule of the District’s Proportionate Share of the Net Pension Liability and
Schedule of District Contributions
Year ended June 30, 2016
(Unaudited)

Schedule of the District’s Proportionate Share of the Net Pension Liability
CalSTRS and CalPERS Pension Plans
Last 10 Fiscal Years*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CalPERS</th>
<th>CalSTRS</th>
<th>CalPERS</th>
<th>CalSTRS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District’s proportion of the collective net pension liability</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District’s proportionate share of the collective net pension liability</td>
<td>$ 182,497,162</td>
<td>$ 337,293,240</td>
<td>$ 141,882,731</td>
<td>$ 256,538,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District’s covered-employee payroll</td>
<td>155,882,522</td>
<td>235,851,422</td>
<td>126,834,679</td>
<td>211,421,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District’s proportionate share of the collective net pension liability as a% of covered payroll</td>
<td>79.43%</td>
<td>74.60%</td>
<td>83.38%</td>
<td>76.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pension plan’s fiduciary net position as a percentage of total pension liability
CalSTRS: 79.43%  
CalPERS: 74.60%

* The District implemented GASB Statement No. 68 effective July 1, 2014, therefore, data is not available prior to July 1, 2014

Schedule of District Contributions
CalSTRS Pension Plan
Last 10 Fiscal Years*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributions as a percentage of covered-employee payroll</td>
<td>12.78%</td>
<td>12.92%</td>
<td>11.68%</td>
<td>11.87%</td>
<td>11.05%</td>
<td>10.76%</td>
<td>9.76%</td>
<td>9.46%</td>
<td>9.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractually required contribution</td>
<td>$ 27,878,874</td>
<td>$ 21,015,634</td>
<td>$ 17,728,126</td>
<td>$ 17,395,249</td>
<td>$ 17,279,949</td>
<td>$ 17,216,865</td>
<td>$ 16,842,446</td>
<td>$ 18,482,827</td>
<td>$ 18,396,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions in relation to the contractually required contributions</td>
<td>27,878,874</td>
<td>21,015,634</td>
<td>17,728,126</td>
<td>17,395,249</td>
<td>17,279,949</td>
<td>17,216,865</td>
<td>16,842,446</td>
<td>18,482,827</td>
<td>18,396,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution deficiency (excess)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District’s covered-employee payroll</td>
<td>235,851,422</td>
<td>211,421,078</td>
<td>197,516,930</td>
<td>185,551,123</td>
<td>191,864,244</td>
<td>192,583,183</td>
<td>192,692,842</td>
<td>207,975,718</td>
<td>205,287,280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The District implemented GASB Statement No. 68 effective July 1, 2014. Contributions included in this schedule prior to fiscal year 2016 are reported under GASB Statement No. 25.

CalPERS Pension Plan
Last 10 Fiscal Years*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributions as a percentage of covered-employee payroll</td>
<td>11.82%</td>
<td>9.94%</td>
<td>8.98%</td>
<td>9.37%</td>
<td>9.01%</td>
<td>8.74%</td>
<td>8.89%</td>
<td>8.96%</td>
<td>9.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractually required contribution</td>
<td>$ 19,133,361</td>
<td>$ 16,386,804</td>
<td>$ 15,345,462</td>
<td>$ 15,109,137</td>
<td>$ 14,360,463</td>
<td>$ 14,039,142</td>
<td>$ 12,702,976</td>
<td>$ 12,216,963</td>
<td>$ 11,997,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions in relation to the contractually required contributions</td>
<td>19,133,361</td>
<td>16,386,804</td>
<td>15,345,462</td>
<td>15,109,137</td>
<td>14,360,463</td>
<td>14,039,142</td>
<td>12,702,976</td>
<td>12,216,963</td>
<td>11,997,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution deficiency (excess)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District’s covered-employee payroll</td>
<td>155,882,522</td>
<td>126,834,679</td>
<td>131,436,970</td>
<td>127,244,130</td>
<td>129,918,547</td>
<td>130,436,025</td>
<td>130,146,925</td>
<td>129,129,741</td>
<td>129,412,341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The District implemented GASB Statement No. 68 effective July 1, 2014. Contributions included in this schedule prior to fiscal year 2016 are reported under GASB Statement No. 25.

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.
SUPPLEMENTAL FINANCIAL INFORMATION
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
General Fund
Schedule of Balance Sheet Accounts
June 30, 2016

Assets

Cash in county treasury $189,055,059
Cash in banks $19,440,703
Cash in revolving fund $162,472
Accounts, notes, interest and loans receivable, net $35,383,892
Cash Held with Trustee $65,402
Due from other funds $7,225,976
Prepaid expenses and other assets $7,654,953

Total assets $258,988,457

Liabilities and Fund Balance

Liabilities:
Accounts payable $68,388,221
Due to other funds $12,806,001
Amounts held in trusts $517,245
Unearned revenue $6,297,377

Total liabilities $88,008,844

Fund balance:
Restricted $36,241,281
Unrestricted $134,738,332

Total fund balance $170,979,613

Total liabilities and fund balance $258,988,457

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.
## LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

General Fund

Schedule of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance Accounts

Year ended June 30, 2016

### Revenues:

#### Federal revenues:
- Higher Education Acts $12,120,851
- Job Training Partnership Act 5,036,941
- Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) 1,094,975
- Vocational Education Act 5,207,511
- Veterans Education 17,460
- College Work Study 2,569,145
- Supplemental educational opportunity grants 127,478
- Pell (Basic educational opportunity grants) 262,025
- Other 6,995,440

**Total federal revenues** 33,431,826

#### State revenues:
- State apportionments 438,612,711
- Tax relief subvention 5,634,165
- State lottery 21,829,375
- CA Works Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids 4,785,640
- Extended opportunity program 8,152,639
- Matriculation program 45,922,613
- Disabled Students Programs and Services 7,226,519
- Other 13,925,317

**Total state revenues** 546,088,979

#### Local revenues:
- Local property taxes 199,513,329
- Enrollment fees 24,775,161
- Tuition and fees, net of scholarship discounts and allowance 15,046,893
- Community service fees 5,993,694
- Parking fees 3,356,558
- Health service fees 5,351,564
- Student fees and charges 2,812,866
- Interest 1,559,443
- Other 10,604,349

**Total local revenues** 269,013,857

**Total revenues** 848,534,662

### Expenditures:

#### Current:
- Academic salaries 304,637,408
- Classified salaries 165,983,722
- Employee benefits 163,554,174
- Books and supplies 14,235,240
- Contract services, student grants, and other operating expenditures 91,466,878
- Capital outlay and equipment replacement: 16,758,656
- Other 923,520

**Total expenditures** 757,559,598

**Excess of revenues over expenditures:** 90,975,064

### Other financing uses:

- Operating transfers in (out) (22,021,159)
- Net increase in fund balance 68,953,905

**Fund balances at July 1, 2015** 102,025,708

**Fund balances at June 30, 2016** $170,979,613

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.
## LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

### Special Revenue Funds

#### Combined Schedule of Balance Sheet Accounts

**June 30, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>Special Reserve Fund</th>
<th>Cafeteria Fund</th>
<th>Child Development Fund</th>
<th>Bookstore Fund</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash in county treasury</td>
<td>$92,614,232</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>400,031</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>93,014,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash in banks</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>538,892</td>
<td>423,829</td>
<td>4,123,094</td>
<td>5,085,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash in revolving fund</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,889</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>98,563</td>
<td>101,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts, notes, interest and loans receivable, net of allowance for doubtful accounts</td>
<td>1,888,407</td>
<td>30,446</td>
<td>1,743,969</td>
<td>2,370,338</td>
<td>6,033,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due from other funds</td>
<td>7,219,269</td>
<td>256,893</td>
<td>417,976</td>
<td>403,148</td>
<td>8,297,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>70,318</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4,260,691</td>
<td>4,331,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>$101,721,908</strong></td>
<td><strong>899,438</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,985,805</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,255,834</strong></td>
<td><strong>116,862,985</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Liabilities and Fund Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable</td>
<td>$689,571</td>
<td>39,931</td>
<td>691,314</td>
<td>249,753</td>
<td>1,670,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to other funds</td>
<td>2,896,906</td>
<td>174,274</td>
<td>1,284,783</td>
<td>879,856</td>
<td>5,235,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total liabilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,586,477</strong></td>
<td><strong>215,082</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,976,097</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,604,426</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,382,082</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund balance:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital projects</td>
<td>98,135,431</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>98,135,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>684,356</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7,189,002</td>
<td>7,873,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve for facility improvements and inventory</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,462,406</td>
<td>2,462,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve for program and capital expenditures</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,009,708</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,009,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total fund balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>98,135,431</strong></td>
<td><strong>684,356</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,009,708</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,651,408</strong></td>
<td><strong>109,480,903</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total liabilities and fund balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>$101,721,908</strong></td>
<td><strong>899,438</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,985,805</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,255,834</strong></td>
<td><strong>116,862,985</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.
## LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
### Special Revenue Funds
#### Combined Schedule of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance Accounts
#### Year ended June 30, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Special Reserve Fund</th>
<th>Cafeteria Fund</th>
<th>Child Development Fund</th>
<th>Bookstore Fund</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal revenues:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and fees</td>
<td>$ —</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>285,299</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>285,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child &amp; Adult Care</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,406,328</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,406,328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACC FTA Project</td>
<td>2,433,575</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,433,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total federal revenues</strong></td>
<td>2,433,575</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,691,627</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4,125,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State revenues:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State apportionment</td>
<td>8,297,486</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8,297,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6,320,493</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6,320,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total state revenues</strong></td>
<td>8,297,486</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6,320,493</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>14,617,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local revenues:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food service sales</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,572,921</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,572,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore sales</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>447,953</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>447,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>707,586</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,485</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>724,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2,385,710</td>
<td>447,953</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>2,834,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total local revenues</strong></td>
<td>3,093,296</td>
<td>2,020,874</td>
<td>16,485</td>
<td>24,905,439</td>
<td>30,036,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenues</strong></td>
<td>13,824,357</td>
<td>2,020,874</td>
<td>8,028,605</td>
<td>24,905,439</td>
<td>48,779,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic salaries</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3,987,104</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3,987,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified salaries</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>422,774</td>
<td>2,530,162</td>
<td>4,127,479</td>
<td>7,080,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee benefits</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>42,980</td>
<td>1,469,790</td>
<td>1,508,075</td>
<td>3,020,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books and supplies</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,441,741</td>
<td>587,900</td>
<td>16,269,798</td>
<td>18,299,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract services, student grant, and other operating expenditures</td>
<td>9,986,171</td>
<td>94,599</td>
<td>11,931</td>
<td>1,236,385</td>
<td>11,329,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11,931</td>
<td>247,076</td>
<td>247,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital outlay</td>
<td>2,199,199</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>38,375</td>
<td>2,255,744</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditures</strong></td>
<td>12,185,370</td>
<td>2,002,094</td>
<td>8,605,057</td>
<td>23,427,188</td>
<td>46,219,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess (deficit) of revenues over (under) expenditures</td>
<td>1,638,987</td>
<td>18,780</td>
<td>(576,452)</td>
<td>1,478,251</td>
<td>2,559,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other financing sources – operating transfers in (out)</td>
<td>14,899,726</td>
<td>168,618</td>
<td>954,895</td>
<td>409,545</td>
<td>16,432,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net increase (decrease) in fund balances</td>
<td>16,538,713</td>
<td>187,398</td>
<td>378,443</td>
<td>1,887,796</td>
<td>18,992,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund balances at July 1, 2015</td>
<td>81,596,718</td>
<td>496,958</td>
<td>631,265</td>
<td>7,763,612</td>
<td>90,488,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund balances at June 30, 2016</td>
<td>$98,135,431</td>
<td>684,356</td>
<td>1,009,708</td>
<td>9,651,408</td>
<td>109,480,903</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Debt Service Fund
Schedule of Balance Sheet Accounts
June 30, 2016

Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash held with trustee</td>
<td>$287,797,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts, notes, interest and loans receivable, net</td>
<td>23,455,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>$311,252,691</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Liabilities and Fund Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liabilities:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unearned revenue</td>
<td>$23,455,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other liabilities</td>
<td>81,158,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total liabilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>104,613,648</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund balance:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>206,639,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total fund balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>206,639,043</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total liabilities and fund balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>$311,252,691</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.
## LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

**Debt Service Fund**

Schedule of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance Accounts  
Year ended June 30, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$ —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total local revenues</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures:</strong></td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current:</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service</td>
<td>211,265,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract services, student grant, and other</td>
<td>195,040,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operating expenditures</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest expense on capital asset-related debt</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditures</strong></td>
<td>406,305,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deficit of expenditures over revenues</strong></td>
<td>406,305,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other financing sources:</strong></td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local tax for G.O. Bonds</td>
<td>281,377,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total other financing sources</strong></td>
<td>281,377,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net increase in fund balance</strong></td>
<td>(124,928,149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund balances at July 1, 2015</strong></td>
<td>331,567,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund balances at June 30, 2016</strong></td>
<td>$ 206,639,043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.
# LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Post Retirement Health Insurance Fund

Schedule of Balance Sheet Accounts

June 30, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>$ —</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total assets</td>
<td>$ —</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Liabilities and Fund Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities:</th>
<th>$ 83,666,179</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unfunded OPEB payable</td>
<td>$ 83,666,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total liabilities</td>
<td>$ 83,666,179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund balance:</th>
<th>(83,666,179)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>(83,666,179)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total fund balance</td>
<td>(83,666,179)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total liabilities and fund balance</td>
<td>$ —</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Post Retirement Health Insurance Fund
Schedule of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance (Deficit) Accounts
Year ended June 30, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue:</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other nonoperating revenue</td>
<td>8,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total local revenues</td>
<td>8,668</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Expenditures:                 |
|-------------------------------|------|
| Current:                      |
| Employee benefits             | 20,236,846|
| Total expenditures            | 20,236,846|
| Deficit of expenditures over revenues | (20,228,178) |

| Other financing sources       |
|-------------------------------|------|
| Operating transfers in (out)  | 5,588,375|
| Total other financing sources | 5,588,375|
| Net decrease in fund balance  | (14,639,803) |

| Fund balances                 |
|-------------------------------|------|
| at July 1, 2015               | (69,026,376) |
| at June 30, 2016              | $ (83,666,179) |

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT  
Scholarship and Loan Fund  
Schedule of Balance Sheet Accounts  
June 30, 2016

Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash held with trustee</td>
<td>$1,008,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts, notes, interest and loans receivable, net</td>
<td>$3,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,011,840</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Liabilities and Fund Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Due to other funds</td>
<td>$—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other liabilities</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total liabilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve for expendable fund balance</td>
<td>$3,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve for nonexpendable fund balance</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total fund balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,003,840</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total liabilities and fund balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,011,840</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Scholarship and Loan Fund
Schedule of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance Accounts
Year ended June 30, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment income – noncapital</td>
<td>$ 7,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total revenues</td>
<td>7,842</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditures</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess of revenues over expenditures</td>
<td>(158)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net decrease in fund balance</td>
<td>(158)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fund balances at July 1, 2015           1,003,998
Fund balances at June 30, 2016          $ 1,003,840

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.
## LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Building Fund

Schedule of Balance Sheet Accounts

June 30, 2016

### Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash in county treasury</td>
<td>$75,603,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash in banks</td>
<td>$8,567,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts, notes, interest, and loans receivable, net of allowance for doubtful accounts</td>
<td>$514,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due from other funds</td>
<td>$7,940,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses and other assets</td>
<td>$34,530,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit with trustee</td>
<td>$34,701,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>$161,858,528</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Liabilities and Fund Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable</td>
<td>$90,851,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to other funds</td>
<td>$838,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total liabilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>$91,689,932</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund balance:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved for capital expenditures</td>
<td>$70,168,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total fund balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>$70,168,596</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total liabilities and fund balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>$161,858,528</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Building Fund
Schedule of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance Accounts
Year ended June 30, 2016

Local revenues:
Interest $ 2,637,002
Other 335,655
Total revenue 2,972,657

Expenditures:
Other operating expenses and services 14,188,340
Capital outlay 258,696,539
Total expenditures 272,884,879
Deficit of expenditures over revenues (269,912,222)

Other financing sources:
Proceeds from issuance of debt —
Total other financing sources —
Net increase in fund balance (269,912,222)

Fund balances at July 1, 2015 340,080,818
Fund balances at June 30, 2016 $ 70,168,596

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Student Financial Aid Fund
Schedule of Balance Sheet Accounts
June 30, 2016

**Assets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash in county treasury</td>
<td>$1,232,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash in banks</td>
<td>4,062,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts, notes, interest and loans receivable, net</td>
<td>7,402,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due from other funds</td>
<td>407,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,105,547</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Liabilities and Fund Balance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liability</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable</td>
<td>$5,177,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to other funds</td>
<td>4,991,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total liabilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,169,232</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund balance:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>2,936,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total fund balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,936,315</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total liabilities and fund balance | **$13,105,547**|

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Student Financial Aid Fund
Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balances
Year ended June 30, 2016

Revenues:
Federal revenues:
  Supplemental educational opportunity grants $ 2,877,893
  Pell (Basic educational opportunity grants) 171,859,942
  Direct Loan 30,543,852
  Other 304,187
  Total federal revenues 205,585,874

State revenues:
  Extended opportunity program 7,197,269
  Cal Grant 14,692,697
  Other 520,242
  Total state revenues 22,410,208

Local revenues:
  Interest —
  Other 218,985
  Total local revenues 218,985

Total revenues 228,215,067

Expenditures:
  Student Grant 227,835,499
  Total expenditures 227,835,499
  Excess of revenues over expenditures 379,568
  Net increase in fund balance 379,568

Fund balances at July 1, 2015 2,556,747
Fund balances at June 30, 2016 $ 2,936,315

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.
# LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Expendable Trust Fund – Associated Student Organization Funds and Agency Funds

ASO Trust Fund – Combined Schedule of Balance Sheet Accounts

June 30, 2016

## Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>East</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>West Los Angeles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>City College</td>
<td>Harbor College</td>
<td>Mission College</td>
<td>Pierce College</td>
<td>Southwest College</td>
<td>Trade College</td>
<td>Valley College</td>
<td>College Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash in banks</strong></td>
<td>$276,941</td>
<td>234,560</td>
<td>105,029</td>
<td>462,226</td>
<td>908,390</td>
<td>221,158</td>
<td>1,477,230</td>
<td>958,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investments</strong></td>
<td>1,338,688</td>
<td>166,748</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>72,343</td>
<td>610,451</td>
<td>20,281</td>
<td>1,454,690</td>
<td>1,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accounts, notes, interest and receivable, net of allowance for doubtful accounts</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9,558</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3,219</td>
<td>22,636</td>
<td>16,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inventory</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3,219</td>
<td>22,636</td>
<td>16,037</td>
<td>4,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital assets</strong></td>
<td>42,361</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>25,004</td>
<td>280,915</td>
<td>54,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td>$1,657,990</td>
<td>410,866</td>
<td>205,029</td>
<td>534,569</td>
<td>1,522,060</td>
<td>264,075</td>
<td>2,972,961</td>
<td>1,246,166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Liabilities and Fund Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities:</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>West Los Angeles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accounts payable</strong></td>
<td>$29,622</td>
<td>9,063</td>
<td>14,623</td>
<td>128,045</td>
<td>781,228</td>
<td>14,134</td>
<td>462,299</td>
<td>25,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unearned revenue</strong></td>
<td>14,110</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3,773</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>17,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long-term liabilities</strong></td>
<td>1,076,017</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>133,092</td>
<td>823,461</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,022,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total liabilities</strong></td>
<td>$1,119,749</td>
<td>9,063</td>
<td>14,623</td>
<td>128,045</td>
<td>781,228</td>
<td>14,134</td>
<td>462,299</td>
<td>25,384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fund balance:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>East</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>West Los Angeles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>City College</td>
<td>Harbor College</td>
<td>Mission College</td>
<td>Pierce College</td>
<td>College Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment in fixed assets</strong></td>
<td>42,360</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>25,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund balances – designated for future expenditures</strong></td>
<td>495,881</td>
<td>401,803</td>
<td>190,406</td>
<td>406,524</td>
<td>740,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total fund balance</strong></td>
<td>$538,241</td>
<td>401,803</td>
<td>190,406</td>
<td>406,524</td>
<td>740,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total liabilities and fund balance</strong></td>
<td>$1,657,990</td>
<td>410,866</td>
<td>205,029</td>
<td>534,569</td>
<td>1,522,060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.
# LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Expendable Trust Fund – Associated Student Organization Funds and Agency Funds

ASO Trust Fund – Combined Schedule of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance Accounts

Year ended June 30, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East Los Angeles College</th>
<th>Los Angeles City College</th>
<th>Los Angeles Harbor College</th>
<th>Los Angeles Mission College</th>
<th>Los Angeles Pierce College</th>
<th>Los Angeles Southwest College</th>
<th>Los Angeles Trade Technical College</th>
<th>Los Angeles Valley College</th>
<th>West Los Angeles College</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$220,384</td>
<td>$77,049</td>
<td>$18,385</td>
<td>$294,980</td>
<td>$177,707</td>
<td>$54,371</td>
<td>$57,835</td>
<td>$37,746</td>
<td>$41,892</td>
<td>980,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenues</strong></td>
<td>$220,384</td>
<td>$77,049</td>
<td>$18,385</td>
<td>$294,980</td>
<td>$177,707</td>
<td>$54,371</td>
<td>$57,835</td>
<td>$37,746</td>
<td>$41,892</td>
<td>980,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract services and other operating expenditures</td>
<td>203,005</td>
<td>74,836</td>
<td>20,932</td>
<td>207,711</td>
<td>133,067</td>
<td>44,004</td>
<td>541,596</td>
<td>42,619</td>
<td>16,858</td>
<td>1,284,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditures</strong></td>
<td>203,005</td>
<td>74,836</td>
<td>20,932</td>
<td>207,711</td>
<td>133,067</td>
<td>44,004</td>
<td>541,596</td>
<td>42,619</td>
<td>16,858</td>
<td>1,284,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net increase (decrease) in fund balance</strong></td>
<td>17,379</td>
<td>2,213</td>
<td>(2,547)</td>
<td>87,269</td>
<td>44,460</td>
<td>10,367</td>
<td>(483,761)</td>
<td>(4,873)</td>
<td>25,034</td>
<td>(304,279)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund balances at July 1, 2015</td>
<td>$520,862</td>
<td>$399,590</td>
<td>$192,953</td>
<td>$319,255</td>
<td>$696,192</td>
<td>$106,482</td>
<td>$2,167,189</td>
<td>$1,225,655</td>
<td>$135,432</td>
<td>5,763,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund balances at June 30, 2016</td>
<td>$538,241</td>
<td>$401,803</td>
<td>$190,406</td>
<td>$406,524</td>
<td>$740,832</td>
<td>$116,849</td>
<td>$1,683,428</td>
<td>$1,220,782</td>
<td>$160,466</td>
<td>5,459,331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.
## LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Expendable Trust Fund – Associated Student Organization Funds and Agency Funds

Student Representation Fee Trust Fund – Combined Schedule of Balance Sheet Accounts

### June 30, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>East Los Angeles College</th>
<th>Los Angeles City College</th>
<th>Los Angeles Harbor College</th>
<th>Los Angeles Mission College</th>
<th>Los Angeles Pierce College</th>
<th>Los Angeles Southwest College</th>
<th>Los Angeles Trade Technical College</th>
<th>Los Angeles Valley College</th>
<th>Los Angeles West Los Angeles Trade College</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash in banks</td>
<td>$ 10,412</td>
<td>137,726</td>
<td>76,901</td>
<td>51,410</td>
<td>291,797</td>
<td>15,170</td>
<td>36,329</td>
<td>98,362</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td>23,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts, notes, interest and receivable, net of allowance for doubtful accounts</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total assets</td>
<td>$ 10,412</td>
<td>137,726</td>
<td>76,901</td>
<td>51,410</td>
<td>291,797</td>
<td>15,170</td>
<td>36,329</td>
<td>150,998</td>
<td>23,852</td>
<td>794,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund balances – designated for future expenditures</td>
<td>$ 10,412</td>
<td>137,726</td>
<td>76,901</td>
<td>51,410</td>
<td>291,797</td>
<td>15,170</td>
<td>36,329</td>
<td>150,998</td>
<td>23,852</td>
<td>794,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total fund balance</td>
<td>10,412</td>
<td>137,726</td>
<td>76,901</td>
<td>51,410</td>
<td>291,797</td>
<td>15,170</td>
<td>36,329</td>
<td>150,998</td>
<td>23,852</td>
<td>794,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total liabilities and fund balance</td>
<td>$ 10,412</td>
<td>137,726</td>
<td>76,901</td>
<td>51,410</td>
<td>291,797</td>
<td>15,170</td>
<td>36,329</td>
<td>150,998</td>
<td>23,852</td>
<td>794,595</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.
## LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Expendable Trust Fund – Associated Student Organization Funds and Agency Funds

Student Representation Fee Trust Fund – Combined Schedule of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance Accounts

Year ended June 30, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East Los Angeles College</th>
<th>Los Angeles City College</th>
<th>Los Angeles Harbor College</th>
<th>Los Angeles Mission College</th>
<th>Los Angeles Pierce College</th>
<th>Los Angeles Southwest College</th>
<th>Los Angeles Trade College</th>
<th>Los Angeles Technical College</th>
<th>Los Angeles Valley College</th>
<th>West Los Angeles College</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$64,935</td>
<td>38,169</td>
<td>21,973</td>
<td>20,765</td>
<td>47,051</td>
<td>16,358</td>
<td>31,959</td>
<td>30,942</td>
<td>33,406</td>
<td>305,558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenues</strong></td>
<td>$64,935</td>
<td>38,169</td>
<td>21,973</td>
<td>20,765</td>
<td>47,051</td>
<td>16,358</td>
<td>31,959</td>
<td>30,942</td>
<td>33,406</td>
<td>305,558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract services and other operating expenditures</td>
<td>88,809</td>
<td>39,795</td>
<td>11,459</td>
<td>11,975</td>
<td>13,692</td>
<td>11,457</td>
<td>16,875</td>
<td>3,811</td>
<td>30,960</td>
<td>228,833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditures</strong></td>
<td>88,809</td>
<td>39,795</td>
<td>11,459</td>
<td>11,975</td>
<td>13,692</td>
<td>11,457</td>
<td>16,875</td>
<td>3,811</td>
<td>30,960</td>
<td>228,833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net increase (decrease) in fund balance</td>
<td>(23,874)</td>
<td>(1,626)</td>
<td>10,514</td>
<td>10,459</td>
<td>33,359</td>
<td>4,901</td>
<td>15,084</td>
<td>27,131</td>
<td>2,446</td>
<td>76,725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund balances at July 1, 2015</td>
<td>34,286</td>
<td>139,352</td>
<td>66,387</td>
<td>42,620</td>
<td>258,438</td>
<td>10,269</td>
<td>21,245</td>
<td>123,867</td>
<td>21,406</td>
<td>717,870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund balances at June 30, 2016</td>
<td>$10,412</td>
<td>137,726</td>
<td>76,901</td>
<td>51,410</td>
<td>291,797</td>
<td>15,170</td>
<td>36,329</td>
<td>150,998</td>
<td>23,852</td>
<td>794,595</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.
OTHER SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION
The Los Angeles Community College District (the District) was established on July 1, 1969 and comprises an area of approximately 882 square miles located in Los Angeles County. There were no changes in the boundaries of the District during the year. The District currently operates nine colleges as follows:

- East Los Angeles College
- Los Angeles City College
- Los Angeles Harbor College
- Los Angeles Mission College
- Los Angeles Pierce College
- Los Angeles Southwest College
- Los Angeles Trade–Technical College
- Los Angeles Valley College
- West Los Angeles College

The Board of Trustees for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016 comprised the following members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Term expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scott J. Svonkin</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>June 30, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Eng</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>June 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Fong</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>June 30, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andra Hoffman</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>June 30, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney K. Kamlager</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>June 30, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest H. Moreno</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>June 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Pearlman</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>June 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexa Victoriano</td>
<td>Student Trustee</td>
<td>May 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administration

Dr. Francisco C. Rodriguez, Chancellor
Dr. Adriana D. Barrera, Deputy Chancellor
Dr. Robert B. Miller, Vice Chancellor - Finance and Resource Development
Dr. Ryan M. Corner, Vice Chancellor of Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness
Ms. Jeanette L. Gordon, Chief Financial Officer/Treasurer
Mr. James D. O’Reilly, Chief Facilities Executive
Mr. Kevin D. Jeter, Interim General Counsel
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Organization

June 30, 2016

(Unaudited)

College Presidents

Marvin R. Martinez    East Los Angeles College
Renee D. Martinez    Los Angeles City College
Dr. Otto W. K. Lee    Los Angeles Harbor College
Dr. Monte E. Perez    Los Angeles Mission College
Dr. Kathleen Burke    Los Angeles Pierce College
Dr. Linda Rose    Los Angeles Southwest College
Laurence B. Frank    Los Angeles Trade–Technical College
Dr. Erika A. Endrijonas    Los Angeles Valley College
Mr. Robert Sprague *    West Los Angeles College

* Interim
## LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Schedule of Workload Measures for State General Apportionment

Annual 2015-16 Apportionment Attendance Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Reported data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Summer Intersession (Summer Seg 2 Only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Noncredit</td>
<td>1,204.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Credit</td>
<td>5,475.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Summer Intersession (Summer Seg 1 Only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Noncredit</td>
<td>103.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Credit</td>
<td>4,293.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Primary Terms (Exclusive Of Summer Intersessions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Census Procedure Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Weekly Census Contact Hours</td>
<td>68,777.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Daily Census Contact Hours</td>
<td>8,596.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Actual Hours Of Attendance Procedure Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Noncredit</td>
<td>4,829.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Credit</td>
<td>4,357.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Independent Study/Work Experience Education Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Weekly Census Procedure Crs</td>
<td>6,330.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Daily Census Procedure Crs</td>
<td>3,632.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Noncredit Independent Study</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Total FTES</td>
<td>107,601.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Supplemental Information

- E. In-Service Training Courses                                          2,888.78
- F. For Future Use                                                        
- G. For Future Use                                                        
- H. Basic Skills Courses:                                                 
  1. Noncredit                                                             4,647.34  
  2. Credit                                                                5,494.17  
- I. CCFS-320 Addendum                                                     
  CDCP Noncredit FTES                                                      4,130.00  
- J. Centers FTES                                                          
  a. Noncredit                                                             N/A  
  b. Credit                                                                N/A  

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT  
Reconciliation of Governmental Funds to the Statement of Net Position  
Year ended June 30, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Special Revenue Fund</th>
<th>Debt Service Fund</th>
<th>Retirement Health Insurance Fund</th>
<th>Building Fund</th>
<th>Student Financial Aid Fund</th>
<th>ASO Fund</th>
<th>Scholarship Loan Fund</th>
<th>General Long-term Fixed Assets</th>
<th>Other GASB Adj to general long-term Debt</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 2016 unaudited ending fund balance</td>
<td>$170,979,613</td>
<td>109,480,903</td>
<td>206,609,664</td>
<td>($83,666,179)</td>
<td>70,168,596</td>
<td>2,936,315</td>
<td>6,253,926</td>
<td>1,003,840</td>
<td>4,293,822,378</td>
<td>(3,646,723,932)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current assets:
1. Adjustment to receivables: ($514,358)
2. Adjustment to payables: $0
3. Adjustment to cash and deposit with trustee: $825,886
4. Prepaid assets: $1,600,511,781
5. Capital assets: $4,293,822,378
6. Other assets: $94,355,050
7. Deferred Outflows: $94,355,050

Long-term liabilities are not booked as part of fund balances:
8. G.O. Bonds: $25,088,528
9. Unamortized premium bond: ($344,600,684)
10. Pension Obligation: ($519,790,403)
11. Workers’ compensation claims payable: ($33,816,000)
12. General liability: ($5,357,000)
13. Vacations benefits payable: ($1,306,583)
14. Capital lease payable: ($35,178,934)
15. Deferred Inflows: $35,178,934

June 30, 2016 net position | $265,646,181 | 109,480,903 | 367,330,824 | ($83,666,179) | 91,982,831 | 2,936,315 | 6,253,926 | 1,003,840 | 4,293,822,378 | (4,666,723,932) | $407,887,097 |

* This includes ASO Trust Fund and Student Representation Fee Trust Fund

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Reconciliation of ECS 84362 (50 Percent Law) Calculation
Year ended June 30, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object/TOP code</th>
<th>Activity (ECSA)</th>
<th>Activity (ECSB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reported data</td>
<td>Audit adjustments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E       Activity (ECSA)</td>
<td>E       Activity (ECSB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Salary Cost</td>
<td>Total CEE</td>
<td>AC 0100-5900 and AC 6110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object/TOP code</td>
<td>Instructional Salary Cost</td>
<td>Total CEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic salaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional salaries:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract or regular</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>$110,195,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>101,719,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total instructional salaries</td>
<td>211,915,445</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noninstructional salaries:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract or regular</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total noninstructional salaries</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total academic salaries</td>
<td>211,915,445</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified salaries:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noninstructional salaries:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Status</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total noninstructional salaries</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional aides:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular status</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>10,244,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>868,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total instructional aides</td>
<td>11,113,214</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee benefits</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>65,961,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and materials</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating expenses</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>4,033,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment replacement</td>
<td>6420</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditures prior to exclusions</td>
<td>293,024,429</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Reconciliation of ECS 84362 (50 Percent Law) Calculation
Year ended June 30, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object/TOP code</th>
<th>Activity (ECS A)</th>
<th>Activity (ECS B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reported data</td>
<td>Audit adjustments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartile Code</td>
<td>Instructional Salary Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC 0100-5900 and AC 6110</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5900</td>
<td>$ ---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6441</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6491</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6740</td>
<td>22,910,154</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exclusions:

Activities to exclude:
- Instructional staff-retirees' benefits and retirement incentives
- Student health services above amount collected
- Student transportation
- Noninstructional staff-retirees' benefits and retirement incentives

Objects to exclude:
- Rents and leases
- Lottery expenditures:
  - Academic salaries
  - Classified salaries
  - Employee 3000
- Supplies and materials:
  - Software
  - Books, magazines, and periodicals
  - Instructional supplies and materials
  - Noninstructional, supplies and materials
- Other operating expenses and services

Capital outlay:
- Library books
- Equipment:
  - Equipment – additional
  - Equipment – replacement
- Other outgo
- Total exclusions

Other outgo
- Total capital outlay

Total for ECS 84362, 50% Law

Percent of CEE (Instructional Salary Cost/Total CEE) 52.99% 100.00%

50% of current expense of education

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.
## LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Proposition 30 Education Protection Account (EPA) Report

Year ended June 30, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity classification</th>
<th>Activity code</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPA proceeds</td>
<td>8630</td>
<td>$ 87,729,566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity classification</th>
<th>Activity code</th>
<th>Salaries and benefits (1000-3000)</th>
<th>Operating expenses (4000-5000)</th>
<th>Capital outlay (6000)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional activities</td>
<td>0100–5900</td>
<td>$ 87,034,674</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>87,034,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other support activities</td>
<td>6XXX</td>
<td>317,414</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>317,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditures for EPA</td>
<td>$ 87,352,088</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87,352,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues less expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 377,478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.
## LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
### Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards
#### Year ended June 30, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal grantor/pass-through grantor/program or cluster title</th>
<th>Federal CFDA number</th>
<th>Award or pass-through identification number</th>
<th>Passed through to subrecipients</th>
<th>Total federal expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Department of Agriculture:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-through California Department of Education:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child and Adult Care Food Programs</td>
<td>10.558</td>
<td>04056-CACFP-19-CC-CS</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>694,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total U.S. Department of Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>694,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Department of Labor:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct programs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-1B Technical Skills Training Grants</td>
<td>17.268</td>
<td>HG-22731-12-60-A-6</td>
<td>1,088,411</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-1B Technical Skills Training Grants</td>
<td>17.268</td>
<td>HG-22706-12-60-A-6</td>
<td>1,036,692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College and Career Training</td>
<td>17.282</td>
<td>TC-23-756-12-60-A-6</td>
<td>598,142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal direct programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,019,725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-through City of Long Beach:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-1B Health Sector Training Grant</td>
<td>17.268</td>
<td>32781</td>
<td>136,992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-through City of Los Angeles:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyle Heights Health Career Program</td>
<td>17.283</td>
<td>124496</td>
<td>110,850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Sector Partnership Initiative</td>
<td>17.277</td>
<td>T5906</td>
<td>125,918</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Youth Employment</td>
<td>17.258</td>
<td>126679</td>
<td>15,306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouthSource System</td>
<td>17.259</td>
<td>126678</td>
<td>691,592</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pass-through Community Career Development, Inc./ Wildridge-Metro WorkSource Center:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Sector Initiative Program</td>
<td>17.258</td>
<td>T57761</td>
<td>26,727</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pass-through Forsyth Technical Community College:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium for Bioscience Credentials</td>
<td>17.282</td>
<td>FTCC-LAVC</td>
<td>477,048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pass-through Coalition for Responsible Community Development:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouthBuild Program</td>
<td>17.274</td>
<td>YB-24556-13-60-A-6</td>
<td>6,778</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pass-through Northern Virginia Community College:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credential Career Program</td>
<td>17.282</td>
<td>TC-23776-12-60-A-51</td>
<td>24,830</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal pass-through programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,616,041</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total U.S. Department of Labor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,635,766</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Science Foundation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct programs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and Student Support to Improve STEM Transfers</td>
<td>47.076</td>
<td>1068483</td>
<td>283,357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riding the Road Map to Transfer Program</td>
<td>47.076</td>
<td>1154552</td>
<td>113,669</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship in STEM to Achieve Results</td>
<td>47.076</td>
<td>1458676</td>
<td>38,696</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium for Undergraduate Research Experiences</td>
<td>47.049</td>
<td>1460538</td>
<td>100,743</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium for Undergraduate Research Experiences</td>
<td>47.049</td>
<td>AST-115675</td>
<td>6,042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total National Science Foundation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>542,507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Department of Energy:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-through Stanford Transportation Group LLC:</td>
<td>81.087</td>
<td>STG-LAVC-001</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total U.S. Department of Energy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Department of Education:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct programs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Institutional Aid</td>
<td>84.031</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,313,573</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Programs</td>
<td>84.016</td>
<td></td>
<td>98,402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIO-Student Support Services</td>
<td>84.042</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,664,760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIO-Talent Search</td>
<td>84.044</td>
<td></td>
<td>473,930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIO-Upward Bound</td>
<td>84.047</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,803,404</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIO-Educational Opportunity Centers</td>
<td>84.066</td>
<td></td>
<td>241,233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Minority-Serving Institutions</td>
<td>84.382</td>
<td></td>
<td>167,762</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student financial assistance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Supplement Educational Opportunity Grants (FSEOG)</td>
<td>84.007</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,002,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Work Study Program</td>
<td>84.033</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,745,902</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Perkins Loan Program</td>
<td>84.038</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,072,441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Pell Grant Program</td>
<td>84.063</td>
<td></td>
<td>172,050,561</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Direct Student Loans</td>
<td>84.268</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,543,852</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal direct programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>224,177,920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
## LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
### Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards
#### Year ended June 30, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal grantor/pass-through grantor/program or cluster title</th>
<th>Federal CFDA number</th>
<th>Award or pass-through identification number</th>
<th>Passed through to subrecipients</th>
<th>Total federal expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Department of Agriculture:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-through California Department of Rehabilitation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College to Career Program DOR</td>
<td>84.126</td>
<td>29667</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>187,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-through San Mateo County Community College District/Canada College: California Alliance for the Long-term Strengthening of Transfer Engineering Programs</td>
<td>84.031</td>
<td>P031C110159</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>88,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-through Los Angeles Unified School District:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEAR UP</td>
<td>84.334</td>
<td>1,200,250</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>40,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEAR UP</td>
<td>84.334</td>
<td>4,400,003,478</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>39,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEAR UP</td>
<td>84.334</td>
<td>1,200,251</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>39,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEAR UP</td>
<td>84.334</td>
<td>4,400,002,613</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>17,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEAR UP</td>
<td>84.334</td>
<td>4,400,003,423</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-through Marymount College/Project GRAD Los Angeles:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEAR UP</td>
<td>84.334</td>
<td>PGLA 2011-18</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>74,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-through University of Southern California:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USC TRIO Upward Bound Program</td>
<td>84.047</td>
<td>10,342,364</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-through Cal State L.A. University Auxiliary Services, INC: First in the World CSULA</td>
<td>84.116</td>
<td>WLAC231225</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>101,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-through California State University Dominguez Hills:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUD-Title V HSI Cooperative</td>
<td>84.031</td>
<td>5977</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>156,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUD-Title V HSI Cooperative</td>
<td>84.031</td>
<td>P031S110042</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total pass-through programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,758,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total U.S. Department of Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>231,936,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Department of Health and Human Services:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct programs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Student Loans</td>
<td>93.364</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>70,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal direct programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>70,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-through California Community College’s Chancellors Office:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)</td>
<td>93.558</td>
<td>4362501711014</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,094,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-through California Department of Education:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Child Care Homes</td>
<td>93.575</td>
<td>CFCC-5011</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>98,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Child Care Homes</td>
<td>93.596</td>
<td>CFCC-5011</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>178,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Child Care and Development Program</td>
<td>93.575</td>
<td>CCTR-5096</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>154,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Child Care and Development Program</td>
<td>93.596</td>
<td>CCTR-5096</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>280,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-through California State University Northridge:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILD @ CSUN</td>
<td>93.310</td>
<td>F-14-3510-ELAC</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILD @ CSUN</td>
<td>93.310</td>
<td>F-14-3510-LAMC</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>37,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILD @ CSUN</td>
<td>93.310</td>
<td>F-14-3510-LAPC</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal pass-through programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,025,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total U.S. Department of Health and Human Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,095,648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards
Year ended June 30, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal grantor/pass-through grantor/program or cluster title</th>
<th>Award or pass-through identification number</th>
<th>Passed through to subrecipients</th>
<th>Total federal expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Transportation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Administration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Advanced Transportation</td>
<td>20.514 CA-64-7003-00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>199,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway Administration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwight David Eisenhower Transportation Fellowship Program</td>
<td>20.215 DTFH6415G</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total U.S. Department of Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>214,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation for National and Community Service:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americorps</td>
<td>94.006 N/A</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>304,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Corporation for National and Community Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>304,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures of Federal Awards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 102,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>245,439,296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.
### LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

#### Schedule of State Financial Awards

Year ended June 30, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program name</th>
<th>Cash received</th>
<th>Accounts receivable</th>
<th>Deferred income</th>
<th>Total program revenues</th>
<th>Total program expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education Block Grant</td>
<td>$ 7,000,000</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4,249,105</td>
<td>2,750,895</td>
<td>2,750,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Skills</td>
<td>1,396,989</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,396,989</td>
<td>1,486,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAL Grants</td>
<td>12,096,759</td>
<td>6,339</td>
<td>172,637</td>
<td>11,930,461</td>
<td>11,930,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Career Pathways Trust</td>
<td>9,352,656</td>
<td>1,262,841</td>
<td>5,570,585</td>
<td>5,044,912</td>
<td>5,044,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State Preschool Program</td>
<td>2,671,191</td>
<td>1,035,562</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3,706,753</td>
<td>3,706,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalWORKs</td>
<td>5,011,570</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>225,930</td>
<td>4,785,640</td>
<td>4,785,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating Agencies Foster Youth Educational Support (CAFYES)</td>
<td>1,344,904</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>366,811</td>
<td>978,093</td>
<td>978,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Agencies Resource for Education (CARE)</td>
<td>1,379,032</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>63,469</td>
<td>1,315,563</td>
<td>1,315,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTE Enhancement</td>
<td>1,398,379</td>
<td>805,314</td>
<td>314,118</td>
<td>1,889,575</td>
<td>1,889,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Students Program and Services (DSPS)</td>
<td>7,226,519</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7,226,519</td>
<td>8,137,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and Workforce Development</td>
<td>2,749,665</td>
<td>1,196,993</td>
<td>146,136</td>
<td>3,800,522</td>
<td>3,800,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Employment Opportunity</td>
<td>30,800</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>30,800</td>
<td>27,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL/Basic Skills Professional Development</td>
<td>387,600</td>
<td>614,247</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,001,847</td>
<td>1,001,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Opportunity Program and Services (EOPS)</td>
<td>13,059,588</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3,336</td>
<td>13,056,252</td>
<td>13,056,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Child Care Homes</td>
<td>295,145</td>
<td>71,592</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>366,737</td>
<td>366,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster and Kinship Care Education (FKCE)</td>
<td>763,292</td>
<td>470,535</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,233,827</td>
<td>1,233,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Student Success Grant</td>
<td>3,471,476</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>701,896</td>
<td>2,769,580</td>
<td>2,769,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Child Care and Development</td>
<td>947,805</td>
<td>344,914</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,292,719</td>
<td>1,292,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle College High School (MCHS)</td>
<td>39,600</td>
<td>59,400</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>99,000</td>
<td>99,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Education</td>
<td>1,082,918</td>
<td>83,006</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,165,924</td>
<td>1,165,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osher Scholar</td>
<td>189,875</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>189,875</td>
<td>189,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Equity</td>
<td>18,192,105</td>
<td>586,200</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>18,778,305</td>
<td>14,143,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Financial Aid Administration</td>
<td>5,480,045</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5,480,045</td>
<td>5,444,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Success &amp; Support (Credit)</td>
<td>25,701,827</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>25,701,827</td>
<td>21,877,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Success &amp; Support (Noncredit)</td>
<td>1,442,481</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,442,481</td>
<td>740,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Time Block Grant/Instructional Equipment/Deferred Maintenance</td>
<td>5,809,733</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5,809,733</td>
<td>3,789,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other State Assistance Programs</td>
<td>715,718</td>
<td>770,402</td>
<td>11,560</td>
<td>1,474,560</td>
<td>1,590,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total state programs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 129,307,910</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,307,345</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,841,923</strong></td>
<td><strong>124,773,332</strong></td>
<td><strong>114,669,440</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.
A. Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards and State Financial Awards

(1) Basis of Presentation

The accompanying schedule of expenditures of federal awards (the SEFA) and the schedule of state financial awards present the activity of all federal and state financial assistance programs of the Los Angeles Community College District (the District) for the year ended June 30, 2016. The District’s reporting entity is defined in the basic financial statements. All federal financial assistance received directly from federal agencies as well as federal financial assistance passed through other government agencies are included in the SEFA.

The information in the SEFA is presented in accordance with the requirements of Title 2 U.S. Code of Federal Regulations part 200, Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance). Because the SEFA presents only a selected portion of the operations of the District, it is not intended to and does not represent the financial position, changes in net assets, or cash flows of the District.

The information in the schedule of state financial awards is presented to comply with reporting requirements of the California Community College Chancellor’s Office.

Basis of Accounting

The accompanying SEFA and the schedule of state financial awards are presented using the accrual basis of accounting.

Expenditures on the SEFA are recognized following the cost principles contained in the Uniform Guidance, wherein certain types of expenditures are not allowable or are limited as to reimbursement. The District utilizes a negotiated rate for salary and benefits of 32% which management expects to renegotiate upon expiration at June 30, 2017.

(2) Reconciliations to Basic Financial Statements

Amounts reported in the accompanying schedule of state financial awards agree with the amounts reported in the related basic financial statements, in all material respects.

State revenue in fund financial statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$546,088,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Revenue Funds</td>
<td>$8,297,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development Fund</td>
<td>$6,320,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Financial Aid Fund</td>
<td>$22,410,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total state revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$583,117,166</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
Total state revenue in accompanying schedule $124,773,332

Add:

General Fund:
Basic and equalization aid 350,446,961
State Mandated Costs 60,634,810
State lottery 21,829,375
Tax relief subvention 5,634,165
Other state funds 19,206,472
Total other General Fund revenue 457,751,783

Special Revenue Fund:
Community College Construction Act 592,051
Total state revenue in fund financial statements $583,117,166

(3) Federal Student Loan Programs

The federal student loan programs listed below are administered directly by the District, and balances and transactions relating to these programs are included in the District’s basic financial statements. Loans outstanding at the beginning of the year and loans made during the year and administrative cost allowances are included in the federal expenditures presented in the SEFA. The District made the following advances and had the following loans outstanding, which were held by the District as of June 30, 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster name/program title</th>
<th>CFDA number</th>
<th>Loan advances made</th>
<th>Loan balances outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student financial aid cluster:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Perkins Loans (FPL)</td>
<td>84.038</td>
<td>$72,250</td>
<td>$3,827,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Direct Student Loans</td>
<td>84.268</td>
<td>30,543,852</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Student Loans</td>
<td>93.364</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>63,660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) Administrative Cost Allowances

Administrative cost allowances included in the accompanying SEFA are summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Cost Allowances</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant</td>
<td>$124,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Work-Study Program</td>
<td>$97,168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$221,555
(5) **Federal Clusters of Programs**

The following table summarizes the expenditures of federal program clusters included in the SEFA:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFDA number</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants (FSEOG)</td>
<td>$3,002,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Work Study (FWS)</td>
<td>$2,745,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Perkins Loan Program (FPL)</td>
<td>$4,072,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Pell Grant Program (PELL)</td>
<td>$172,050,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Direct Student Loans (Direct Loan)</td>
<td>$30,543,852</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Federal Expenditures:** $212,414,856

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFDA number</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Child Care Homes</td>
<td>$98,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Child Care Homes</td>
<td>$178,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Child Care and Development Program</td>
<td>$154,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Child Care and Development Program</td>
<td>$280,518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Child Care Expenditures:** $711,401

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFDA number</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRIO - Student Support Services</td>
<td>$1,664,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIO - Talent Search</td>
<td>$473,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIO - Upward Bound</td>
<td>$2,803,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIO - Educational Opportunity Centers</td>
<td>$241,233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total TRIO Expenditures:** $5,183,327

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFDA number</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)</td>
<td>$1,094,975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total TANF Expenditures:** $1,094,975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFDA number</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Sector Initiative Program</td>
<td>$26,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Youth Employment</td>
<td>$15,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Source Center</td>
<td>$691,592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Expenditures:** $733,625
B. Schedule of Workload Measures for State General Apportionment

Full-time equivalent students is a measurement of the number of students attending classes of the District. The purpose of attendance accounting from a fiscal standpoint is to provide the basis on which apportionments of State funds are made to community college districts. This schedule provides information regarding the attendance of students based on various methods accumulating attendance data.

C. Reconciliation of Governmental Funds to the Statement of Net Position

This schedule provides the information necessary to reconcile the governmental fund balances included in the supplementary information to the Statement of Net Position.

D. Reconciliation of ECS 843632 (50% Law) Calculation

This schedule provides the information necessary to reconcile the 50% Law Calculation reported on the CCFS-311 to the audited financial statements.

E. Proposition 30 Education Protection Account (EPA) Report

This schedule reports the District’s EPA proceeds and summarizes how the EPA proceeds were spent.
INDEPENDENT AUDITORS’ REPORT ON
STATE COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS
Independent Auditors’ Report on State Compliance Requirements

The Honorable Board of Trustees
Los Angeles Community College District
Los Angeles, California:

Report on State Compliance

We have audited the Los Angeles Community College District’s (the District) compliance with the types of compliance requirements described in the California Community Colleges Contracted District Audit Manual (CDAM) 2015-16, issued by the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office for the year ended June 30, 2016.

Management Responsibility

Management is responsible for compliance with the requirements of laws, regulations, contracts, and grants applicable to its state program.

Auditor’s Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the District’s compliance with the requirements referred to above. We conducted our audit of compliance in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America; the standards applicable to financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States; and the California Community Colleges Contracted District Audit Manual (CDAM) 2015-16, issued by the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether noncompliance with the types of compliance requirements referred to above could have a direct and material effect on the state programs noted below. An audit includes 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 audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion on compliance with the requirements referred to above. However, our audit does not provide a legal determination of the District’s compliance with those requirements.

Compliance Requirements

In connection with the audit referred to above, we selected and tested transactions and records to determine the District’s compliance with the state laws and regulations applicable to the following items:

Section 421 - Salaries of Classroom Instructors (50% Law)

Section 423 - Apportionment for Instructional Service Agreements/Contracts

Section 424 - State General Apportionment Funding System

Section 425 - Residency Determination for Credit Courses
Section 426 - Students Actively Enrolled
Section 427 - Concurrent Enrollment of K-12 Students in Community College Credit Courses
Section 429 – Student Success and Support Program (SSSP)
Section 430 - Scheduled Maintenance Program
Section 431 - Gann Limit Calculation
Section 435 - Open Enrollment
Section 438 - Student Fees – Health Fees and Use of Health Fee Funds
Section 439 - Proposition 39 Clean Energy
Section 440 - Intersession Extension Program
Section 475 - Disabled Student Programs and Services (DSPS)
Section 479 - To Be Arranged Hours (TBA)
Section 490 - Proposition 1D State Bond Funded Projects
Section 491 - Proposition 30 Education Protection Account Funds

**Opinion on State Compliance**

In our opinion, Los Angeles Community College District complied, in all material respects, with the types of compliance requirements referred to above that are applicable to the state programs listed above for the year ended June 30, 2016.

**Other Matters**

The results of our auditing procedures disclosed instances of noncompliance which are required to be reported in accordance with the *California Community Colleges Contracted District Audit Manual* (CDAM) 2015-16, issued by the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, and which are described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs as findings S-2015.001 through S-2015.004. Our opinion on the state programs listed above is not modified with respect to these matters.

The District’s responses to the noncompliance findings identified in our audit are described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs. The District’s responses were not subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of compliance and, accordingly, we express no opinion on the responses.

**Report on Other Supplemental Information**

We have audited the District’s compliance with the types of compliance requirements described in the *California Community Colleges Contracted District Audit Manual (CDAM) 2015-16*, issued by the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office for the year ended June 30, 2016.
Our audit was conducted in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America, the standards applicable to financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, and the California Community Colleges Contracted District Audit Manual (CDAM) 2015-16, issued by the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office 2015-16. The other supplementary information on pages __ through __ is presented for purposes of additional analysis as required by the CDAM published by the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office.

The other supplemental information is the responsibility of management. Such information, except the supplementary information on page 73, has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied to the audit of the District’s compliance with the types of compliance requirements described in the California Community Colleges Contracted District Audit Manual (CDAM) 2015-16, issued by the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, and certain additional procedures, including comparing and reconciling such information directly to the underlying accounting records, financial statements as of and for the year ended June 30, 2016 audited by other auditors, whose report is included herein on pages __ through __, and other records, in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. In our opinion the accompanying other supplemental information is fairly stated, in all material respects, in relation to financial statements taken as a whole, audited by other auditors whose report was dated December __, 2016.

**Purpose of This Report**

The purpose of this report is solely to describe the scope of our testing over state laws and regulations based on the requirements described in the California Community Colleges Contracted District Audit Manual (CDAM) 2015-16. Accordingly, this report is not suitable for any other purpose.

Los Angeles, California
December __, 2016
ADDITIONAL REPORTS OF INDEPENDENT AUDITORS
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

The Honorable Board of Trustees:

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 financial statements of the Los Angeles Community College District (the District), which comprise the statements of net position as of June 30, 2016 and 2015, and the related statements of revenues, expenses, and changes in net position and the cash flows for the years then ended, and the related notes to the financial statements, and have issued our report thereon dated December 7, 2016.

Internal Control over Financial Reporting

In planning and performing our audit of the financial statements, we considered the 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 the District’s internal control. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the 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 the entity’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 was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control that might be material weaknesses or significant deficiencies and therefore, material weaknesses or significant deficiencies may exist that were not identified. 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. We did identify certain deficiencies in internal control, identified as 2016-001 and 2016-002 and described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs that we consider to be significant deficiencies.

Compliance and Other Matters

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the District’s financial statements are free from 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 instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under Government Auditing Standards.

The District’s Response to Findings

The District’s responses to the findings identified in our audit is described previously. The District’s response was not subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the financial statements and, accordingly, we express no opinion on the response.

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 Example 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 District’s internal control and compliance. Accordingly, this communication is not suitable for any other purpose.

Los Angeles, California
December 7, 2016
Report of Independent Auditors on Compliance for Each Major Federal Program 
and on Internal Control over Compliance Required by the Uniform Guidance

The Honorable Board of Trustees  
Los Angeles Community College District  
Los Angeles, California

Report on Compliance for Each Major Federal Program

We have audited Los Angeles Community College District’s (the District) compliance with the types of 
compliance requirements described in the OMB Compliance Supplement that could have a direct and material 
effect on each of the District’s major federal programs for the year ended June 30, 2016. The District’s major 
Federal programs are identified in the summary of auditors’ results section of the accompanying schedule of 
findings and questioned costs.

Management’s Responsibility

Management is responsible for compliance with the requirements of laws, regulations, contracts and grants 
applicable to each of its federal programs.

Auditors’ Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on compliance for each of the District’s major federal programs 
based on our audit of the types of compliance requirements referred to above. We conducted our audit of 
compliance in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America; the 
standards applicable to financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards, issued by the 
Comptroller General of the United States; the audit requirements of Title 2 U.S. Code of Federal Regulations 
Part 200, Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal 
Awards (Uniform Guidance). Those standards and the Uniform Guidance require that we plan and perform 
the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether noncompliance with the types of compliance 
requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on a major federal program 
occurred. An audit includes 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 audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion on compliance for each major federal 
program. However, our audit does not provide a legal determination of the District’s compliance.

Opinion on Each Major Federal Program

In our opinion, Los Angeles Community College District complied, in all material respects, with the 
requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on each of its major federal 
programs for the year ended June 30, 2016.

Other Matters

The results of our auditing procedures disclosed instances of noncompliance with those requirements which 
are required to be reported in accordance with the Uniform Guidance and which are described in the 
accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs as Findings 2016-003 through 2016-014. Our 
opinion on each major federal program is not modified with respect to these matters.
The District’s responses to the noncompliance findings identified in our audit are described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs. The District’s responses were not subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of compliance and, accordingly, we express no opinion on the responses.

**Report on Internal Control over Compliance**

Management of the District is responsible for establishing and maintaining effective internal control over compliance with the types of compliance requirements referred to above. In planning and performing our audit of compliance, we considered the District’s internal control over compliance with the types of requirements that could have a direct and material effect on each major federal program to determine the auditing procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances for the purpose of expressing an opinion on compliance for each major federal program and to test and report on internal control over compliance in accordance with the Uniform Guidance, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of internal control over compliance. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the District’s internal control over compliance.

A *deficiency in internal control over compliance* exists when the design or operation of a control over compliance does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct, noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of a federal program on a timely basis. A *material weakness in internal control over compliance* is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control over compliance, such that there is a reasonable possibility that material noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of a federal program will not be prevented, or detected and corrected, on a timely basis. A *significant deficiency in internal control over compliance* is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control over compliance with a type of compliance requirement of a federal program that is less severe than a material weakness in internal control over compliance, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance.

Our consideration of internal control over compliance 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 compliance that might be material weaknesses or significant deficiencies. We did not identify any deficiencies in internal control over compliance that we consider to be material weaknesses. However, we identified certain deficiencies in internal control over compliance, as described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs as Findings 2016-003 through 2016-014, that we consider to be significant deficiencies.

The District’s responses to the internal control over compliance findings identified in our audit are described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs. The District’s responses were not subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of compliance and, accordingly, we express no opinion on them.

**Purpose of this Report**

The purpose of this report on internal control over compliance is solely to describe the scope of our testing of internal control over compliance and the results of that testing based on the requirements the Uniform Guidance. Accordingly, this report is not suitable for any other purpose.

Los Angeles, California  
December ____, 2016
Report on Other Supplemental Information

We have audited the District’s compliance with the types of compliance requirements described in the California Community Colleges Contracted District Audit Manual (CDAM) 2015-16, issued by the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office for the year ended June 30, 2016.

Our audit was conducted in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America, the standards applicable to financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, and the California Community Colleges Contracted District Audit Manual (CDAM) 2015-16, issued by the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office 2015-16. The other supplementary information on pages __ through __ is presented for purposes of additional analysis as required by the Contracted District Manual published by the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office.

The other supplemental information is the responsibility of management. Such information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied to the audit of the District’s compliance with the types of compliance requirements described in the California Community Colleges Contracted District Audit Manual (CDAM) 2015-16, issued by the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, and certain additional procedures, including comparing and reconciling such information directly to the underlying accounting records, financial statements as of and for the year ended June 30, 2016 audited by other auditors, whose report is included herein on pages __ through __, and other records, in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. In our opinion the accompanying other supplemental information is fairly stated, in all material respects, in relation to financial statements taken as a whole, audited by other auditors whose report was dated December __, 2016.

Purpose of This Report

The purpose of this report is solely to describe the scope of our testing over state laws and regulations based on the requirements described in the California Community Colleges Contracted District Audit Manual (CDAM) 2015-16. Accordingly, this report is not suitable for any other purpose.

Los Angeles, California
December __, 2016

The Honorable Board of Trustees
Los Angeles Community College District
Los Angeles, California


We have audited the accompanying schedule of expenditures of federal awards and schedule of state financial awards of the Los Angeles Community College District (the District) for the year ended June 30, 2016.

Management’s Responsibility for the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards and Schedule of State Financial Awards

Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of the schedule of expenditures of federal awards and schedule of state financial awards 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 the schedule of expenditures of federal awards and the schedule of state financial awards that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

Auditors’ Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these schedules 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 schedule of expenditures of federal awards and schedule of state financial awards are free of material misstatement.

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the schedule of expenditures of federal awards and schedule of state financial awards. The procedures selected depend on the auditor’s judgment, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement of the schedule of expenditures of federal awards and schedule of state financial awards, 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 schedule of expenditures of federal awards and the schedule of state financial awards 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 policies used and the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the schedule of expenditures of federal awards and schedule of state financial awards. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.
Opinion on the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards and Schedule of State Financial Awards

In our opinion, the schedule of expenditures of federal awards and schedule of state financial awards referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the federal and state expenditures of the Los Angeles Community College District for the year ended June 30, 2016, in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the Board of Trustees, Audit Committee, District’s management, the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, and the federal and state awarding and pass-through entities, and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Los Angeles, California
December __, 2016
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
Year ended June 30, 2016

(1) Summary of Auditors’ Results

Financial Statements
(a) The type of report issued on the financial statements: Unmodified
(b) Internal control over financial reporting:
   • Material weakness(es) identified: None
   • Significant deficiencies identified that are not considered to be material weaknesses: 2016-001 and 2016-002
(c) Noncompliance which is material to the basic financial statements: None

Federal Awards
(d) Internal control over major programs:
   • Material weakness(es) identified: No.
   • Significant deficiencies identified that are not considered to be material weaknesses: Yes. See findings 2016-003 to 2016-014.
(e) The type of report issued on compliance for major programs:
   Student Financial Assistance Cluster – Unmodified.
   H-1B Job Training Grants – Unmodified.
   Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College and Career Training (TAACCCT) – Unmodified.
(f) Any audit findings which are required to be reported in accordance with the Uniform Guidance: Yes.
(g) Dollar threshold used to distinguish between Type A and Type B programs: $3,000,000.
(h) Major programs:
   U.S. Department of Education
   • Student Financial Assistance Cluster:
     84.007 Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (FSEOG)
     84.033 Federal Work Study (FWS)
     84.038 Federal Perkins Loan (FPL)
     84.268 Federal Direct Student Loans (Direct Loan)
     84.063 Federal Pell Grant (PELL)
   • H-1B Job Training Grants – CFDA 17.268
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- Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College and Career Training (TAACCCT) Grants – CFDA 17.282
  (i) Auditee qualified as a low-risk auditee under the Uniform Guidance: Yes.

State Awards
(j) Internal control over state programs:
  - Material weakness(es) identified: No.
  - Significant deficiencies identified that are not considered to be material weaknesses: Yes. See findings S-2016.001 and S-2016.004.

(e) The type of auditor’s report issued on compliance for state programs - Unmodified

(2) Summary of Current Year Findings and Questioned Costs Relating to Federal Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Student financial assistance cluster – special tests and provisions – borrower data transmission and reconciliation – no monthly reconciliation of SAS data files to institution records and late reporting to the direct loan servicing system (DLSS) via common origination and disbursement (COD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Career and technical education – basic grants to state (perkins IV) – equipment management – enforcement of policies and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Higher education – institutional aid – equipment management – enforcement of policies and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Trade adjustment assistance community college and career training (TAACCCT) grants – allowable costs/cost principles – payroll documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Trade adjustment assistance community college and career training (TAACCCT) grants – level of effort – level of service requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Trade adjustment assistance community college and career training (TAACCCT) grants – procurement, suspension and debarment – vendor status verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. H-1B Job training grants – allowable costs/cost principles – duplicate payroll charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. H-1B Job training grants – eligibility – limited proof of review of participant information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. H-1B Job training grants – equipment management – enforcement of policies and procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Finding number

10. H-1B Job training grants – procurement, suspension and debarment – vendor status verification

11. H-1B Job training grants – level of effort – level of service requirement

12. H-1B Job training grants – report – inaccurate reporting of recipient’s share on expenditures

2016-001 – Financial Reporting

Condition and Context

During our review of the District’s draft financial statements and the financial reporting process, we noted that a significant number of revisions were required to present the financial statements in accordance with U. S. generally accepted accounting principles. The revisions required were primarily focused on footnotes with complex accounting issues, such as investments and pension plan disclosures. In addition, journal entries prepared by District staff relating to the District’s pension plans were not appropriately reviewed or reported in accordance with the applicable framework and guidance. As a result, audit adjustments were necessary to properly state pension plan related accounts.

Cause and Effect

Financial reporting and accounting for governmental entities has increased in complexity during the last several years. The Governmental Accounting Standards Board has recently issued multiple new pronouncements that expanded the requirements of financial reporting and have changed how governments are required to record and report pension liabilities and the fair value of assets and liabilities. These additional pronouncements will likely cause financial reporting personnel within governments to implement new policies and procedures to ensure these new requirements are satisfactorily met, and undergo increased training in order to effectively prepare and review financial statements.

Criteria

A significant deficiency in internal controls is the result of a deficiency in internal controls, or combination of deficiencies, that adversely affects the entity’s ability to initiate, authorize, record, process, or report financial data reliably in accordance with U.S. GAAP such that there is more than a remote likelihood that a misstatement of the entity’s financial statements that is more than inconsequential will not be prevented or detected. We believe the control deficiencies described above represent a significant deficiency in internal controls.

Recommendation

We recommend that the District provide additional training and resources for those responsible for the preparation of the District’s financial statements. We also recommend that management enhance their policies to ensure that the financial statements are prepared by individuals knowledgeable of governmental
financial reporting requirements and that management develop a more robust review process of the financial statements to ensure accurate financial reporting.

**View of Responsible Officials**

The District accepts this recommendation and will initiate steps to evaluate the internal findings noted by KPMG and identify opportunities for enhancement noted in the District’s staffing and training. The District recognizes the increased complexity government entities face due to new accounting standard imposed in recent years. These new standards require a higher degree of accounting professional development and experience to properly implement.

Toward this end, the District recognizes the need to provide senior-level professional accounting, financial, and administrative support to the CFO in a variety of areas including technical review of periodic and special accounting and financial reports, statements and summaries. Specifically, a management-level position has been created charged with providing technical and functional supervision and training to personnel assigned to financial reporting tasks at the colleges and all units under the direction of the CFO.

The District will assure that the accounting staff will receive ongoing training.

**2016-002: Information Technology**

**Condition and Context**

During our review of the District’s information technology controls during the fiscal 2007 audit, KPMG identified control weaknesses in the areas of user access & security, and change management. These included the sharing of user accounts, extensive privileged and super user access and informal change management processes. These issues were determined to be significant deficiencies in the District’s system of internal controls. During the 2016 fiscal audit, KPMG evaluated the progress made and the controls implemented to remediate the weaknesses identified during the 2007 audit and determine if we can place reliance on the IT environment and controls.

During our review of the District’s General Information Technology controls during the fiscal 2016 audit, KPMG noted that significant progress has been made to address the previously identified security deficiencies. The District implemented Security Weaver, which is a tool used to control access to the SAP environment and monitor user activity of users with privileged access. As such, it appears that privileged access is restricted. Although privileged access has been restricted to authorized users, we noted opportunities for enhancements that can help further reduce the risk of excessive access.

While progress has been made with the implementation of Security Weaver, control weaknesses continue to exist in the form of excessive access to business and functional user accounts. This included extensive access to business users, IT users having functional level access and insufficient segregation of duties. The SAP security issues continue to be significant deficiencies in the District’s system of internal controls. As a result, KPMG cannot place reliance on the IT environment and controls.

**Cause and Effect**

During 2006-07, LACCD completed post implementation activities for a new Enterprise Resource Planning System (SAP). In addition, in September 2013, the District implemented an SAP wide update. During both
the implementation and the update, certain access controls were not fully implemented and certain duties needed to be shared. While not ideal from a control standpoint, this also is not unusual for organizations that must continue to support business operations as complex systems implementations are being completed. However, weaknesses in the IT controls can significantly compromise both the security and accuracy of the data within a system and it is important that adequate controls are implemented.

Criteria
A significant deficiency in internal controls is the result of a deficiency in internal controls, or combination of deficiencies, that adversely affects the entity’s ability to initiate, authorize, record, process, or report financial data reliably in accordance with U.S. GAAP such that there is more than a remote likelihood that a misstatement of the entity’s financial statements that is more than inconsequential will not be prevented or detected. We believe the control deficiencies described above continue to represent a significant deficiency in internal controls.

Recommendation
As noted above, significant IT issues exist that prevent KPMG from placing reliance on the District’s IT environment and controls. Also, opportunities exist to further enhance privileged access to SAP. In order to remediate IT issues and to support the District’s plans to expand the use of SAP, KPMG recommends the following action items:

- Perform a security assessment to remediate the extensive segregation of duties conflicts. This includes a thorough review of user profiles, creation of a SOD matrix and role redesign. As SOD conflicts exist at business and functional level, this effort should be led by business managers with IT providing necessary support.

- Evaluate the security designation of privileged user accounts and where possible change the access type to further limit access of IT users. Currently, a few privileged user accounts exist that are used for batch processing functions but require IT users to log in. Although Security Weaver will log activities of the users, by changing the designation of such accounts (from Dialog to Service) IT can further limit the risk of excessive access.

View of Responsible Officials
LACCD Management agrees with the finding and the recommendation that we perform a comprehensive security assessment of the Security Roles in SAP for all LACCD Employees. This will be a joint effort with the Business and Functional owners to ensure that each role is evaluated to eliminate segregation of duties conflicts. This will include the assistance of a third party to help implement best practices and provide a scope of work that can be verified and evaluated once the project is completed. IT will support this effort and help implement the redefined roles and will utilize the Segregation of duties matrix to ensure compliance. We will also convert the few batch accounts to Service accounts to further improve security and limit access to continue to reduce risk.
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Finding 2016-003 – Special Tests and Provisions – Borrower Data Transmission and Reconciliation – No Monthly Reconciliation of SAS Data Files to Institution Records and Late Reporting to the Direct Loan Servicing System (DLSS) via Common Origination and Disbursement (COD)

Federal Program Information

Federal Catalog Number: 84.268

Federal Program Name: Student Financial Assistance Cluster: Federal Direct Student Loan (Direct Loan)

Federal Agency: U.S. Department of Education

Pass-Through Entity: N/A

Campus: Los Angeles Pierce College

Federal Award Number and Award Year: OPE ID No. 00122800, July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015

Federal Direct Student Loan ID: G01228

Criteria or Requirement

Institutions must report all loan disbursements and submit required records to the Direct Loan Servicing System (DLSS) via the COD within 15 days of disbursement (OMB No. 1845-0021). Each month, the COD provides institutions with a School Account Statement (SAS) data file which consists of a Cash Summary, Cash Detail, and (optional at the request of the school) Loan Detail records. The school is required to reconcile these files to the institution’s financial records. Since up to three Direct Loan program years may be open at any given time, schools may receive three SAS data files each month (34 CFR sections 685.102(b), 685.301, and 303).

Identified Condition

During our testing of compliance with special tests and provisions requirements for borrower data transmission and reconciliation for direct loans at Los Angeles Pierce College, we noted that the direct loan reconciliation of the School Account Statement data file received from COD with the District’s records have not been prepared for October 2015 and March 2016. In addition we noted that 2 out of 16 direct loan disbursement samples tested were reported late to COD.

Total Direct Loan expenditures for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2015 amounted to $30,543,852.

Questioned Costs

None.
Possible Asserted Cause and Effect

The District utilizes the Common Origination and Disbursement website to report origination and disbursement of direct loans. Adequate monitoring controls do not appear to be in place to ensure that direct loan disbursements are timely reported to COD.

Recommendation

We recommend that the District implement stricter controls to ensure that direct loan disbursements are timely reported to COD.

Views of Responsible Officials and Planned Corrective Actions

The District Central Financial Aid will centralize downloading the SAS reports from COD and run the reconciliation reports monthly for the college. An email notification will be sent when the reconciliation report is available. The College Financial Aid Office will complete the reconciliation process within 15 days from the date the report is generated.

For 2017-18, loan disbursements and reporting in PeopleSoft will be automated to include before and after sequestration disbursements. For 2016-17, the College Financial Aid Office confirms that Fall 2016 disbursements were processed and reported within the required timeframe.


Federal Program Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Catalog Number:</th>
<th>84.268</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Program Name:</td>
<td>Student Financial Assistance Cluster: Federal Direct Student Loan (Direct Loan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agency:</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-Through Entity:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus:</td>
<td>East Los Angeles College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Award Number and Award Year:</td>
<td>14-C01-027, July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criteria or Requirement

Title 2, Subtitle A, Chapter II, Part 200, Subpart D, §200.313 Equipment.

(d) Management requirements. Procedures for managing equipment (including replacement equipment), whether acquired in whole or in part under a Federal award, until disposition takes place will, as a minimum, meet the following requirements:

(1) Property records must be maintained that include a description of the property, a serial number or other identification number, the source of funding for the property (including the FAIN), who
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holds title, the acquisition date, and cost of the property, percentage of Federal participation in the project costs for the Federal award under which the property was acquired, the location, use and condition of the property, and any ultimate disposition data including the date of disposal and sale price of the property.

(2) A physical inventory of the property must be taken and the results reconciled with the property records at least once every two years.

(3) A control system must be developed to ensure adequate safeguards to prevent loss, damage, or theft of the property. Any loss, damage, or theft must be investigated.

(4) Adequate maintenance procedures must be developed to keep the property in good condition.

(5) If the non-Federal entity is authorized or required to sell the property, proper sales procedures must be established to ensure the highest possible return.

Identified Condition
During physical inspection, we noted that 1 out of 11 samples selected could not be located. This has been noted in the latest physical inventory done in June 2015. However, the general ledger has not been adjusted to reflect the missing equipment.

Questioned Costs
$5,177.50 out of $205,884.61 of equipment sampled for physical inspection

Possible Asserted Cause and Effect
Procedures and controls were not properly implemented to comply with federal requirements and District policies over safeguarding of capital assets, which includes annual review of grant asset management at the College. This increases the risk that theft or misappropriation of program equipment may occur and not be detected on a timely basis.

Recommendation
We recommend that the College strictly enforce existing District policies and procedures to ensure that federal equipment management regulations are followed.

Views of Responsible Officials and Planned Corrective Actions

East Los Angeles College

East Los Angeles College will comply with recommendations accordingly and implement ongoing control policies and procedures for federal equipment management.

In addition, internal staff will continue to do yearly physical inventory of the equipment and reconcile equipment records. One of the 11 samples was not located due to the medical leave of the faculty member. However, staff will continue to locate missing equipment and document accordingly.

Federal Program Information

Federal Catalog Number: 84.031

Federal Program Name: Higher Education – Institutional Aid (Improving STEM Success and Access for Hispanic Students)

Federal Agency: U.S. Department of Education

Pass-Through Entity: N/A

Campus: Los Angeles Mission College

Federal Award Number and Award Year: P031C110097-13-14, October 1, 2013 to September 30, 2015 (Improving STEM Success and Access for Hispanic Students)

Title 2, Subtitle A, Chapter II, Part 200, Subpart D, §200.313 Equipment.

(d) Management requirements. Procedures for managing equipment (including replacement equipment), whether acquired in whole or in part under a Federal award, until disposition takes place will, as a minimum, meet the following requirements:

(1) Property records must be maintained that include a description of the property, a serial number or other identification number, the source of funding for the property (including the FAIN), who holds title, the acquisition date, and cost of the property, percentage of Federal participation in the project costs for the Federal award under which the property was acquired, the location, use and condition of the property, and any ultimate disposition data including the date of disposal and sale price of the property.

(2) A physical inventory of the property must be taken and the results reconciled with the property records at least once every two years.

(3) A control system must be developed to ensure adequate safeguards to prevent loss, damage, or theft of the property. Any loss, damage, or theft must be investigated.

(4) Adequate maintenance procedures must be developed to keep the property in good condition.

(5) If the non-Federal entity is authorized or required to sell the property, proper sales procedures must be established to ensure the highest possible return.
Identified Condition
During our test of controls and compliance over equipment management, we noted the following control deficiencies and instances of noncompliance:

- 1 out of 3 samples selected for equipment inspection has no LACCD and HE program tags;
- 1 out of 3 samples selected for equipment inspection has no HE program tag;
- 1 out of 3 samples selected for equipment inspection cannot be located; and
- There was limited evidence that the results of the physical inventory were reconciled with the District’s accounting records (SAP).

Questioned Costs
$9,615.24 out of $23,473.08 of equipment sampled for physical inspection

Possible Asserted Cause and Effect
Procedures and controls were not properly implemented to comply with federal requirements and District policies over safeguarding of capital assets, which includes asset tagging and annual review of grant asset management at the College. This increases the risk that theft or misappropriation of program equipment may occur and not be detected on a timely basis.

Recommendation
We recommend that the College strictly enforce existing District policies and procedures to ensure that federal equipment management regulations are followed.

Views of Responsible Officials and Planned Corrective Actions

Los Angeles Mission College
The STEM program ended September 30, 2016 and the College could not locate the missing equipment. Moving forward the College will monitor, tag, inventory all equipment purchases.
Finding 2016-006 – Allowable Costs/Cost Principles – Payroll Documentation

Federal Program Information

Federal Catalog Number: 17.282

Federal Program Name: Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College and Career Training (TAACCCT) Grants (Los Angeles Healthcare Competencies to Careers Consortium)

Federal Agency: U.S. Department of Labor

Pass-Through Entity: N/A

Campus: East Los Angeles College

Los Angeles Trade Tech College

Federal Award Number and Award Year: TC-25084-13-60-A-6, October 1, 2013 to September 30, 2017

Criteria or Requirement

Title 2, Subtitle A, Chapter II, Part 200, Subpart E, §200.430 Compensation—personal services.

a. General. Compensation for personal services includes all remuneration, paid currently or accrued, for services of employees rendered during the period of performance under the Federal award, including but not necessarily limited to wages and salaries. Costs of compensation are allowable to the extent that they satisfy the specific requirements of this part, and that the total compensation for individual employees:

(1) Is reasonable for the services rendered and conforms to the established written policy of the non-Federal entity, consistently applied to both Federal and non-Federal activities;

(2) Follows an appointment made in accordance with a non-Federal entity’s laws and/or rules or written policies and meets the requirements of Federal statute, where applicable; and

(3) Is determined and supported as provided in paragraph i of this section, Standards for Documentation of Personnel Expenses, when applicable.

b. Standards for Documentation of Personnel Expenses. (1) Charges to Federal awards for salaries and wages must be based on records that accurately reflect the work performed. These records must:

(i) Be supported by a system of internal control which provides reasonable assurance that the charges are accurate, allowable, and properly allocated;

(ii) Be incorporated into the official records of the non-Federal entity;
(iii) Reasonably reflect the total activity for which the employee is compensated by the non-Federal entity, not exceeding 100% of compensated activities (for IHE, this per the IHE’s definition of IBS);

(iv) Encompass both federally assisted and all other activities compensated by the non-Federal entity on an integrated basis, but may include the use of subsidiary records as defined in the non-Federal entity’s written policy;

(v) Comply with the established accounting policies and practices of the non-Federal entity; and

(vi) Support the distribution of the employee’s salary or wages among specific activities or cost objectives if the employee works on more than one Federal award; a Federal award and non-Federal award; an indirect cost activity and a direct cost activity; two or more indirect activities which are allocated using different allocation bases; or an unallowable activity and a direct or indirect cost activity.

Identified Condition
During our review of payroll charged to the TAACCCT Grant at East Los Angeles College and Los Angeles Trade-Technical College, we noted that:

- 1 out of 4 employees sampled at East Los Angeles College did not have documentation of the actual time and effort the employee expended on the program; and
- 2 out of 8 employees sampled at Los Angeles Trade Technical College did not have documentation of the actual time and effort the employee expended on the program.

The other 11 payroll samples (2 from Los Angeles City College, 3 from East Los Angeles College and 6 from Los Angeles Trade-Technical College) have adequate documentation to support salaries and benefits charged to the program.

Questioned Costs
$9,838.99 out of $58,308.80 sampled

Possible Asserted Cause and Effect
Adequate monitoring controls do not appear to be in place to ensure proper documentation of employees’ actual time and effort to support salaries and related benefits charged to the program. Without proper documentation, these expenditures may be considered unallowable.

Recommendation
We recommend that the District implement stricter controls to ensure compliance with the federal program requirements on allowable/unallowable expenditures. Actual time and effort that employees spend on grant-funded activities should be properly documented to support salaries charged to the program.
Views of Responsible Officials and Planned Corrective Actions

**East Los Angeles College**

East Los Angeles College has initiated a process to have the “Time and Effort” document completed by all individuals under the LAH3C Grant to ensure compliance with the federal program requirements on allowable/unallowable expenditures. This document will be forwarded by the SFP to each individual at the end of the month to complete and return to the program director for review and signature. Completed copies will be kept in a Time & Effort notebook.

**Los Angeles Trade Tech College**

In order to ensure compliance with federal program requirements, time and effort reports are submitted by employees under the TAACCCT grant. Per District practice, classroom faculty time is documented by various systems. The class is scheduled and the instructor is then assigned by the Chair and approved by the Dean. The information is then transferred to the payroll system. Absence request forms and absence certification forms are then submitted by the faculty and approved by the Chair, Dean, and Vice President.

Moving forward, all TAACCCT-funded employees—regardless of their function—will complete a time and effort form. Such time and effort forms will be approved by the Chair and the Dean. Upon approval, the forms will be filed by the Program Technician.

**Finding 2016-007 – Level of Effort – Level of Service Requirement**

**Federal Program Information**

| **Federal Catalog Number:** | 17.282 |
| **Federal Program Name:** | Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College and Career Training (TACCCT) Grants (Los Angeles Healthcare Competencies to Careers Consortium) |
| **Federal Agency:** | U.S. Department of Labor |
| **Pass-Through Entity:** | N/A |
| **Campus:** | Los Angeles Trade Tech College |
| **Federal Award Number and Award Year:** | TC-25084-13-60-A-6, October 1, 2013 to September 30, 2017 |
Criteria or Requirement

Per the Statement of Work, the Consortium has projected levels of outcome for certain performance measures as of the end of each program year as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome measures</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total unique participants served</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of participants completing a grant-funded program of study</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of participants retained in their program of study or program of study</td>
<td>1,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of participants completing credit hours</td>
<td>3,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of participants earning credentials</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of participants enrolled in further education</td>
<td>1,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After grant-funded program of study completion</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of participants employed after grant-funded program of study completion</td>
<td>1,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of participants retained in employment after program of study completion</td>
<td>1,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of those participants employed at enrollment</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who received a wage increase post-enrollment</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identified Condition

During our test of compliance, we noted that the Consortium did not meet the goals for the second program year as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome measures</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Percentage met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total unique participants served</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of participants completing a grant-funded program of study</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Outcome measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome measures</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Percentage met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of participants completing credit hours</td>
<td>3,915</td>
<td>2,543</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of participants earning credentials</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of participants enrolled in further education</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After grant-funded program of study completion</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of participants employed after grant-funded program of study completion</td>
<td>1,518</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of participants retained in employment after program of study completion</td>
<td>1,289</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of those participants employed at enrollment</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who received a wage increase post-enrollment</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Questioned Costs**

Not applicable

**Possible Asserted Cause and Effect**

The program encountered significant delay in the implementation at the inception of the grant. As with many grants, the first six months were used to set up budgets and contracts, hire personnel, and prepare for full implementation. The hiring process for the lead administrator took longer than expected. During that time, the college focused on activities and deliverables that would create the process and infrastructure for outcomes. If no supplemental procedures are performed aimed at achieving the projected outcomes for the succeeding program years, there is risk that the Consortium will not meet the targeted level of service of the program at the conclusion of the grant.

**Recommendation**

We recommend that the Consortium continue its outreach and recruitment activities and create more intensive collaborations with different employers, unions, and workforce agencies in accordance with the Statement of Work.

**Views of Responsible Officials and Planned Corrective Actions**

**Los Angeles Trade Tech College**

In efforts to meet target outcomes, LATTC has worked diligently to increase enrollment opportunity and support participant completion, placement, and continuing education. As indicated by our annual reports and actuals/projections of enrollments & completers submitted to DOL, we are on track to meet such outcomes.
In addition, DOL has approved a six month extension. This six month extension expands the program by two additional semesters, giving colleges the opportunity to capture additional enrollments and completers; furthermore, allowing focus on placement and follow up for participants.

Outreach, Lead: Program Director – The program will continue outreach strategies in order to enroll students in accordance to the Statement of Work. Outreach includes, but is not limited to, working with current and new partners such as the WorkSource Center, Employers, Healthcare Associations, and the Adult Education Division of LA Unified School District and LA County Office of Education.

Enrollments & Completers, Lead: Department Chair – LATTC will offer additional sections of classes and ensure schedule gives participants the opportunity to accelerate progression and completion.

Placements, Lead: Program Specialists– Partners like the LA Chamber of Commerce, Health Sector Collaborative, Community Clinic Association of LA County, WorkSource Centers, and the Workforce Investment Board will continue to support job placement strategies by having internships during the program that lead to jobs, prioritizing LAH3C completers for interviews, and continuously sending out job leads. LAH3C is already working on hosting two additional job fairs and has already tentatively scheduled four mock interview session with employers. The development of strategic stacked and latticed certificates will ensure continuing education for participants.

Continue PSE, Lead: Department Chair & Program Director – Development of LAH3C programs were created as stacked and latticed certificates that allows for ongoing education post-completion.

**Finding 2016-008 – Procurement, Suspension and Debarment - Vendor Status Verification**

**Federal Program Information**

**Federal Catalog Number:** 17.282

**Federal Program Name:** Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College and Career Training (TACCCT) Grants (Los Angeles Healthcare Competencies to Careers Consortium)

**Federal Agency:** U.S. Department of Labor

**Pass-Through Entity:** N/A

**Campus:** Los Angeles City College
               Los Angeles Trade Tech College

**Federal Award Number and Award Year:** TC-25084-13-60-A-6, October 1, 2013 to September 30, 2017

**Criteria or Requirement**

Title 2, Subtitle A, Chapter II, Part 200, Subpart C, §200.213 Suspension and debarment.
Nonfederal entities are subject to the non-procurement debarment and suspension regulations implementing Executive Orders 12549 and 12689, 2 CFR part 180. These regulations restrict awards, subawards, and contracts with certain parties that are debarred, suspended, or otherwise excluded from or ineligible for participation in Federal assistance programs or activities.

Identified Condition

During our test of controls, we noted that the suspension and debarment statuses of vendors were not verified prior to procurement.

Questioned Costs

Not applicable

Possible Asserted Cause and Effect

Upon audit inquiry with the District personnel, their procurement department has advised the specially funded program (SFP) directors at the campuses that the directors are the ones responsible regarding all the requirements of the program, including verifying the suspension and debarment statuses of the vendors. However, per discussion with campus personnel, the SFP directors perform procurement procedures under the impression that the District bears such responsibility. The lack of verification of vendors’ statuses prior to procurement increases the risk of transacting with suspended or debarred entities using federal funds.

Recommendation

We recommend that the District communicate clearly and regularly with the campuses as to who shall bear responsibility in verifying the suspension and debarment status of each vendor prior to procurement.

Views of Responsible Officials and Planned Corrective Actions

Los Angeles City College

The District has indicated that there is not an ongoing process to ensure vendors are eligible for participation in Federal activities. Therefore, our corrective action plan is to verify that all future potential vendors are not debarred, suspended, or otherwise excluded from or ineligible for participation in Federal assistance programs or activities prior to any procurement of services or goods. The Program Director and Dean will not approve any purchases unless a printout is attached to the quotes.

We will ensure this occurs by following the two steps below:

1. Verifying the eligibility of the vendor via the System for Award Management (SAM) https://www.sam.gov/portal/SAM/

2. Documenting their eligibility status by keeping a written record of the vendor’s status and attaching it to any purchase order/procurement initiation.

Los Angeles Trade Tech College

Although the District verifies suspension and debarment status of each vendor prior to procurement, the District has indicated that there is no ongoing process to ensure vendors are eligible for participation in
Federal activities. Thus, LATTC commits to verifying the suspension and debarment status of each vendor prior to procurement. The Program Technician will verify using the Federal Debarred Listing website https://www.sam.gov and any other federal resource in which such information can be obtained. The Program Director and Dean will not approve any purchases unless a printout is attached to the quotes.

Finding 2016-009 – Allowable Costs/Cost Principles – Duplicate Payroll Charges

Federal Program Information

Federal Catalog Number: 17.268

Federal Program Name: H-1B Job Training Grants (The Leading Engineering Education for the Future in Los Angeles for Los Angeles Southwest College)

Federal Agency: U.S. Department of Labor

Pass-Through Entity: N/A

Campus: Los Angeles Southwest College

Federal Award Number and Award Year: HG-22706-12-60-A-6, April 2, 2012 to March 31, 2017

Criteria or Requirement

Title 2, Subtitle A, Chapter II, Part 200, Subpart E, §200.403 Factors affecting allowability of costs.

Except where otherwise authorized by statute, costs must meet the following general criteria in order to be allowable under Federal awards:

(a) Be necessary and reasonable for the performance of the Federal award and be allocable thereto under these principles.

(b) Conform to any limitations or exclusions set forth in these principles or in the Federal award as to types or amount of cost items.

(c) Be consistent with policies and procedures that apply uniformly to both federally financed and other activities of the non-Federal entity.

(d) Be accorded consistent treatment. A cost may not be assigned to a Federal award as a direct cost if any other cost incurred for the same purpose in like circumstances has been allocated to the Federal award as an indirect cost.

(e) Be determined in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP), except, for state and local governments and Indian tribes only, as otherwise provided for in this part.
Identified Condition

During our review of payroll charged to the H-1B Job Training Grant at Los Angeles Southwest College, we noted that there were duplicate instructor salary charges during the year.

Questioned Costs

$7,208.08 out of $12,797.68 sampled

Possible Asserted Cause and Effect

Adequate monitoring controls do not appear to be in place to ensure that duplicate charging to the program is avoided. This increases the risk that there might be other potential duplicate charges to the grant during the year.

Recommendation

We recommend that the District implement stricter controls to ensure compliance with the federal program requirements on allowable/unallowable expenditures. Expenditures charged to the grant must be regularly reviewed and monitored to ensure that no costs are charged to the program in duplicate.

Views of Responsible Officials and Planned Corrective Actions

Los Angeles Southwest College

The Program plans to institute the following corrective action plan to avoid duplicate charges to the fund.

- The Program Specialist will submit a Journal Voucher (JV) to correct the duplicate charge; extract budget reports on SAP; ask the District accountant to check the charges in the fund; and review an F1 Posting Report to ensure the JV is processed and posted accurately.
- Every month, the Program Specialist and Office Assistant (Program Staff) will extract and review budget reports to monitor its expenditures and record the date.
- If the Program Staff are asked to submit a JV, they will not rely on the SD reports provided by an employee from another program. Instead, they will do the following before submitting the JV:
  1. Extract a budget report to check if the charges are added to the fund
  2. Ask the District accountant to check charges to the fund
  3. Ask the campus Senior Administrative Analyst to check if the system self-corrected to the appropriate fund
Every month, the Program staff will run an F1 Posting Report to ensure JVs are posted accurately and not accidently charged to the fund.

The responsible officials for this corrective action plan are the CTE and Workforce Development Dean and the SFP Specialist. The date of completion of the plan will be January 3, 2017.

**Finding 2016-010 – Eligibility — Limited Proof of Review of Participant Information**

**Federal Program Information**

- **Federal Catalog Number:** 17.268
- **Federal Program Name:** H-1B Job Training Grants (The Leading Engineering Education for the Future in Los Angeles for Los Angeles Southwest College)
- **Federal Agency:** U.S. Department of Labor
- **Pass-Through Entity:** N/A
- **Campus:** Los Angeles Southwest College
- **Federal Award Number and Award Year:** HG-22706-12-60-A-6, April 2, 2012 to March 31, 2017 for Los Angeles Southwest College
  
  HG-22731-12-60-A-6, April 2, 2012 to September 30, 2016 for West Los Angeles College

**Criteria or Requirement**

**At Los Angeles Southwest College**

Per the Statement of Work, the program will serve 400 unemployed workers in the greater Los Angeles region, 340 (85%) of whom will be long-term unemployed individuals. The Project will focus on serving the low-income communities of South Los Angeles and target unemployed engineers and other unemployed workers who have at least a high school diploma and some post-secondary education and/or related work experience. Priority will be given to veterans and individuals who have been unemployed for 27 weeks or more.

**At West Los Angeles College**

Per the Statement of Work, the program will serve individuals who fall in one of the following three classifications:

- Individuals who have been without a job for 27 weeks or more and who want and are able to work;
- Individuals who are separate from any branch of the US military (Army, Air Force, Navy, Marines, Coast Guard; and
• Individuals who are employed at companies that are part of the project and who need training to (a) secure full-time employment, (b) advance in their careers, or (c) retain their current occupations.

Within these three classifications, particularly the long-term unemployed and veterans, the program will enroll, train, and place a wide variety of individuals including those with barriers to employment such as limited English proficiency, persons 18 year of age and older who have at least a GED or high school diploma and are seeking employment, persons with disabilities, and ex-offenders. The program will provide priority service for veterans and spouses pursuant to The Jobs for Veterans Act (PL 107-288).

Identified Condition

During our test of controls, we noted that controls over eligibility were inadequate at Los Angeles Southwest College. The following control deficiencies were noted:

• There is limited proof that the applications/in-take forms were reviewed to ensure that participants meet the program eligibility requirements;

• No adequate documentation was maintained to verify high school information; and

• 1 out of 12 sampled participants was not properly classified as long-term unemployed per the report submitted to the grantor.

At West Los Angeles College, we noted that there is limited proof of review of beneficiary eligibility prior to payment of reimbursement to employer and workforce partners.

Questioned Costs

Not applicable

Possible Asserted Cause and Effect

Procedures and controls were not properly designed to comply with the federal requirements over verifying beneficiary eligibility information. Lack of verification and inadequate documentation increase the risk that ineligible individuals can participate into the program. Further, due to inaccurate classification of participants, there is risk that the program will not meet the target number of long-term unemployed individuals due to misreporting.

Recommendation

We recommend that the College properly document procedures performed on reviewing beneficiary participant applications, maintain adequate documentation to verify eligibility information, and revisit participant files to accurately classify long-term unemployed individuals.
Views of Responsible Officials and Planned Corrective Actions

Los Angeles Southwest College

The Program plans to institute the following corrective action plan to ensure it maintains adequate documentations to verify eligibility information and accurately classify long-term unemployed individuals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Persons Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document the review of participant applications</td>
<td>The Program staff will add a “Staff Only” section on the participant application and will initial and record the date they review it and the eligibility documents.</td>
<td>Program Specialist and Office Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document the verification of high school eligibility requirement</td>
<td>The Program staff will require participants to provide a copy of their high school diploma, GED certificate, or university transcript with the date of graduation and name of high school.</td>
<td>Program Specialist and Office Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review participant files to accurately classify long-term unemployed individuals</td>
<td>The Program Office Assistant will check the application fields and database records, especially the long-term unemployed status. She will initial and record the review date on each participant’s application. The Program Specialist will check the participants’ application fields and database records; initial and record the review date; and ask the Office Assistant to make corrections, if necessary. If the Office Assistant makes corrections to the database fields, she will resubmit the data file to the Federal agency during the next quarterly transmission.</td>
<td>Program Specialist and Office Assistant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responsible officials for this corrective action plan are the CTE and Workforce Development Dean and the SFP Specialist. The date of completion of the plan will be January 3, 2017.

West Los Angeles College

To ensure substantial proof of beneficiary eligibility, West Los Angeles College will conduct sampling audits to review the sufficiency of documentation of beneficiary eligibility. West Los Angeles review samples of military discharge documents (DD 214), evidence of GED diplomas, and verification of unemployment status through EDD documentation. Every verified participant record will be signed and dated before being referred for payment processing. The responsible officials for this corrective action plan are __________. The date of completion of the plan will be on __________.

Federal Program Information

Federal Catalog Number: 17.268

Federal Program Name: H-1B Job Training Grants (The Leading Engineering Education for the Future in Los Angeles for Los Angeles Southwest College)

Federal Agency: U.S. Department of Labor

Pass-Through Entity: N/A

Campus: Los Angeles Southwest College

Federal Award Number and Award Year: HG-22706-12-60-A-6, April 2, 2012 to March 31, 2017

Criteria or Requirement

Title 2, Subtitle A, Chapter II, Part 200, Subpart D, §200.313 Equipment.

(d) Management requirements. Procedures for managing equipment (including replacement equipment), whether acquired in whole or in part under a Federal award, until disposition takes place will, as a minimum, meet the following requirements:

(1) Property records must be maintained that include a description of the property, a serial number or other identification number, the source of funding for the property (including the FAIN), who holds title, the acquisition date, and cost of the property, percentage of Federal participation in the project costs for the Federal award under which the property was acquired, the location, use and condition of the property, and any ultimate disposition data including the date of disposal and sale price of the property.

(2) A physical inventory of the property must be taken and the results reconciled with the property records at least once every two years.

(3) A control system must be developed to ensure adequate safeguards to prevent loss, damage, or theft of the property. Any loss, damage, or theft must be investigated.

(4) Adequate maintenance procedures must be developed to keep the property in good condition.

(5) If the non-Federal entity is authorized or required to sell the property, proper sales procedures must be established to ensure the highest possible return.
Identified Condition
During our test of controls and compliance over equipment management, we noted the following control deficiencies and incompliance:

- The unit of equipment inspected has no H-1B program tag; and
- Location information is missing from equipment records

Questioned Costs
Not applicable

Possible Asserted Cause and Effect
Procedures and controls were not properly implemented to comply with federal requirements and District policies over safeguarding of capital assets, which includes asset tagging and updating equipment records with location information. This increases the risk that theft or misappropriation of program equipment may occur and not be detected on a timely basis.

Recommendation
We recommend that the College strictly enforce existing District policies and procedures to ensure that federal equipment management regulations are followed.

Views of Responsible Officials and Planned Corrective Actions

Los Angeles Southwest College
The Program plans to institute the following corrective action plan to ensure it tags its assets and updates equipment records with location information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Persons Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asset Tag</td>
<td>The Program Specialist will tag the asset and record the date on the Equipment/Asset Inventory List. The Program Office Assistant will inspect the tag and initial it and record the date on the list. Every quarter, the Program staff will inspect assets to ensure tags are secure and initial and record the date on the list.</td>
<td>Program Specialist and Office Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Records with Location Information</td>
<td>The Program staff will record each asset’s location on the Equipment/Asset Inventory List and ask the District accountant to enter the information into SAP.</td>
<td>Program Specialist and Office Assistant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Every quarter, the Program staff will inspect the location of their assets, review the location information on the Equipment/Asset Inventory List, print the Fixed Asset Reconciliation Report, and record the date.

Program Specialist and Office Assistant

The responsible officials for this corrective action plan are the CTE and Workforce Development Dean and the SFP Specialist. The date of completion of the plan will be January 3, 2017.

Finding 2016-012 –Procurement, Suspension and Debarment- Vendor Status Verification

Federal Program Information

Federal Catalog Number: 17.268

Federal Program Name: H-1B Job Training Grants (The Leading Engineering Education for the Future in Los Angeles for Los Angeles Southwest College)

Federal Agency: U.S. Department of Labor

Pass-Through Entity: N/A

Campus: Los Angeles Southwest College

Federal Award Number and Award Year: HG-22706-12-60-A-6, April 2, 2012 to March 31, 2017

Criteria or Requirement

Title 2, Subtitle A, Chapter II, Part 200, Subpart C, §200.213 Suspension and debarment.

Nonfederal entities are subject to the nonprocurement debarment and suspension regulations implementing Executive Orders 12549 and 12689, 2 CFR part 180. These regulations restrict awards, subawards, and contracts with certain parties that are debarred, suspended, or otherwise excluded from or ineligible for participation in Federal assistance programs or activities.

Identified Condition

During our test of controls, we noted that the suspension and debarment statuses of vendors were not verified prior to procurement.

Questioned Costs

Not applicable
Possible Asserted Cause and Effect

Upon audit inquiry with the District personnel, their procurement department has advised the specially funded program (SFP) directors at the campuses that the directors are the ones responsible regarding all the requirements of the program, including verifying the suspension and debarment statuses of the vendors. However, per discussion with campus personnel, the SFP directors perform procurement procedures under the impression that the District bears such responsibility. The lack of verification of vendors’ statuses prior to procurement increases the risk of transacting with suspended or debarred entities using federal funds.

Recommendation

We recommend that the District communicate clearly and regularly with the campuses as to who shall bear responsibility in verifying the suspension and debarment status of each vendor prior to procurement.

Views of Responsible Officials and Planned Corrective Actions

Los Angeles Southwest College

The Program plans to institute the following corrective action plan to ensure it verifies the suspension and debarment statuses of new and current LACCD vendors prior to procurement:

• The Program Specialist and Office Assistant (Program staff) will look up new and current LACCD vendor on the on-line System for Award Management (SAM) prior to procurement.

• The Program staff will attach a SAM printout of the vendor’s status, verifying that it is not suspended or debarred, along with the date checked, to the Request for Contract Form prior to procurement. If a vendor’s status shows suspension or debarment, the Program staff will document the information and will inform the vendor it will be excluded from the program.

The responsible officials for this corrective action plan are the CTE and Workforce Development Dean and the SFP Specialist. The date of completion of the plan will be January 3, 2017.

Finding 2016-013 —Level of Effort — Level of Service Requirements

Federal Program Information

Federal Catalog Number: 17.268
Federal Program Name: H-1B Job Training Grants (Bridging Emerging Advanced Technology for West Los Angeles College)
Federal Agency: U.S. Department of Labor
Pass-Through Entity: N/A
Campus: West Los Angeles College
Federal Award Number and Award Year: HG-22731-12-60-A-6, April 2, 2012 to September 30, 2016
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
Year ended June 30, 2016

Criteria or Requirement
Per the Statement of Work, the College has projected levels of outcome for certain performance measures as of the end of the grant. The projections were applicable to two participant categories—unemployed and employed individuals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance outcomes</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total participants served</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participants beginning education/training activities</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>2990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participants completing education/training activities</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>2990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participants who complete education/training who receive a degree or other type of credential</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>2990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participants who complete education/training activities who enter unsubsidized employment</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participants who complete education/training activities who retain an employed status in the first and second quarters following initial placement</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>2990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identified Condition
During our test of compliance over the level of effort requirements of the program, we noted that the College did not meet the following targets at the conclusion of the grant with regard to unemployed individuals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance outcomes</th>
<th>Projected performance (unemployed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participants served</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participants beginning education/ training activities</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participants who complete education/ training who receive a degree or other type of credential</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participants who complete education/ training activities who enter unsubsidized employment</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participants who complete education/ training activities who retain an employed status in the first and second quarters following initial placement</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questioned Costs
Not applicable
Possible Asserted Cause and Effect

The program primarily focused on serving employed beneficiary participants resulting in the program far exceeding the projected levels of outcome for employed individuals and falling short for unemployed individuals.

Recommendation

We recommend that the College balance out its outreach and recruitment efforts between unemployed and employed individuals and create more intensive collaborations with workforce agencies to meet projected levels of outcome for unemployed individuals.

Views of Responsible Officials and Planned Corrective Actions

West Los Angeles College

West Los Angeles College, in consultation with the grantor will undertake to revise the target goals of serving unemployed participants in light of the apparent under-performance in that area. Additionally, we will seek to redeploy program resources to that target population, and implement interim benchmarks for meeting program goals. The responsible officials for this corrective action plan are ___________. The date of completion of the plan will be on ____________.

Finding 2016-014 –Reporting — Inaccurate Reporting of Recipient’s Share in Expenditures

Federal Program Information

| Federal Catalog Number:       | 17.268       |
| Federal Program Name:         | H-1B Job Training Grants (Bridging Emerging Advanced Technology for West Los Angeles College) |
| Federal Agency:               | U.S. Department of Labor |
| Pass-Through Entity:          | N/A           |
| Campus:                       | West Los Angeles College |
| Federal Award Number and Award Year: | HG-22731-12-60-A-6, April 2, 2012 to September 30, 2016 |

Criteria or Requirement

Per Title 2, Subtitle A, Chapter II, Part 200, Subpart D, §200.327 Financial reporting and §200.328 Monitoring and Reporting Program Performance, required reports for Federal awards must include all activity of the reporting period, must be supported by applicable accounting or performance records, and should be fairly presented in accordance with governing requirements.
Identified Condition
During our review of the quarterly financial reports submitted to the grantor, we noted that the cumulative recipient share of expenditures is inaccurately reported. The effect is an overstatement of $135,343. However, the overstatement did not result in the noncompliance with the matching requirement of the grant.

Questioned Costs
Not applicable

Possible Asserted Cause and Effect
The recipient share of expenditures consists of two nonfederal resources—matched funds (cash) and leveraged resources (cash and noncash). A portion of the matched funds amounting to $135,343 was also included in the leveraged resources overstating the total recipient share of expenditures.

Recommendation
We recommend that the College perform a more intensive review of the report and underlying supporting documentations to avoid inaccurate reporting of information.

Views of Responsible Officials and Planned Corrective Actions

West Los Angeles College
West Los Angeles College will work through its Office of Administrative Services to ensure accurate and timely monitoring of expenditures, match requirements and their subsequent financial reporting. The responsible officials for this corrective action plan are ___________. The date of completion of the plan will be on ____________.
SCHEDULE OF STATE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT  
Schedule of State Findings and Recommendations  
Year ended June 30, 2016

(1) Summary of State Findings and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Finding number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Residency Determination of Credit Courses – Application for Admission Forms</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Concurrent Enrollment of K-12 Students in Community College Credit Courses – Approvals of Students to Attend Courses</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To Be Arranged Hours – TBA Course Classification</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Disabled Student Programs and Services – Advisory Committee Meetings</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S-2016.001 – Residency Determination for Credit Courses (425) – Application for Admission Forms

State Criteria or Requirement

State apportionment for credit courses may be claimed only for student attendance allowed by statute and regulation. Student residence at the time of registration is a major factor in the determination of allowability for claiming state apportionment for credit courses.

The residency of student in credit courses shall be adequately supported to ensure that each student has been classified as either a “resident” or a “nonresident.” The residence questionnaire used by the District in making residence classifications must require students to certify their answers under oath or penalty of perjury.

References

- Education Code Section 68000-68044, 68050-68080, 68082, 68100, 68130, 76140, 76140.5, and 76143 (note section 68075.5 is amended in 2012, 76140 has an addition and amendment in 2012)
- CCR, Title 5, sections 54000-54072, 59114, and 59116
- California Community College, Student Attendance Accounting Manual (SAAM)

Identified Condition

To ensure that the District only claims apportionment for the attendance of California residents in credit courses, we selected a sample of 130 students (60 regular students and 70 student-athletes) enrolled in credit courses offered by the District. We then tested supporting residency documentation for the students sampled to determine whether each student has been properly classified as either a “resident” or a “nonresident” by inspecting the application for admission (hardcopy and/or electronic) used by the District. In addition, for student-athletes selected for testing, we compared the student’s admission application and residence questionnaire to the athlete’s Commission of Athletics Form 1 for applicable information and to confirm consistency.
In our sample of 70 student-athletes, the admission application forms for 2 out of 20 samples selected for testing at Los Angeles Pierce College could not be located. There appeared to be a lack of monitoring by the District to ensure that each campus retains copies of application for admission forms for student-athletes. Consequently, there was not sufficient evidence to support the assertion that the student-athletes who were claimed for state support were eligible.

*Full-Time Equivalent Student (FTES) Impact*

3.17 FTES exceptions of the 21.98 credit FTES sampled, or 14.42% of the total sample at the campus.

*Questioned Costs*

$14,973.81 (3.17 credit FTES exceptions x $4,723.60 credit FTES reimbursement rate)

This finding has not been adjusted in the Annual Apportionment Report submitted for the year ended June 30, 2016.

*Extrapolated Finding*

Based on the schedule of FY 2016 FTES claimed for student athletes enrolled in credit courses of those campuses where the samples were obtained, the following are the extrapolated FTES for the above finding:

- 37.55 FTES (14.42% x 258.67 total credit FTES claimed for K-12 students taking credit courses at the campus)

These findings have not been adjusted in the Annual Apportionment Report submitted for the year ended June 30.

*Recommendation for Corrective Action*

We recommend that the District strengthen controls to ensure that the application for admission forms are retained by the campus in accordance with District policy. Controls should also be implemented to ensure that student-athletes who were claimed for state support are eligible.

*District Response*

**Los Angeles Pierce College**

These two student samples completed paper admissions applications. Starting January 2016, the Admissions and Records Office no longer accepts paper applications and now requires students to complete an online admissions application as the first step in becoming a student. Electronic application files are stored on the CCCApply server and all information is available upon request.
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Schedule of State Findings and Recommendations
Year ended June 30, 2016

S-2016.002 – Concurrent Enrollment of K-12 Students in Community College Credit Courses (Section 427) – Approvals of Students to Attend Courses

State Criteria or Requirement
The governing board of a school district may determine which pupils would benefit from advanced scholastic or vocational work. The intent of this section is to provide educational enrichment opportunities for a limited number of eligible pupils, rather than to reduce current course requirements of elementary and secondary schools, and also to help ensure a smoother transition from high school to college for pupils by providing them with greater exposure to the collegiate atmosphere. The governing board may authorize those pupils, upon recommendation of the principal of the pupil’s school of attendance, and with parental consent, to attend a community college during any session or term as special part-time or full-time students and to undertake one or more courses of instruction offered at the community college level.

References
California Education Code, Section 48800.

Identified Condition
To ensure that K-12 students who were currently enrolled in community college courses had the proper approvals to attend class and could benefit from advanced scholastic or vocational work, we selected a sample of 60 K-12 students enrolled in courses offered by the District. We then ascertained if these students received required approvals from the K-12 school official prior to enrolling in the community college courses.

During our audit we noted the following:

- 10 out of 24 K-12 students sampled from Los Angeles Pierce College were enrolled in courses that were not included in the courses to be taken by the student that were recommended and approved by the school principal in the K-12 supplemental application for admission forms.
- 2 out of 26 K-12 students sampled from East Los Angeles College were enrolled in courses that were not included in the courses to be taken by the student that were recommended and approved by the school principal in the K-12 supplemental application for admission forms.

There appeared to be inadequate monitoring by the District to ensure that K-12 students are enrolled only in courses that the school principal recommended and approved for the student.

Full-Time Equivalent Student (FTES) Impact

- Los Angeles Pierce College: 1.77 FTES exceptions of the 9.95 credit FTES sampled, or 17.75% of the total sample at the campus.
- East Los Angeles College: 0.21 FTES exceptions of the 5.36 credit FTES sampled, or 3.84% of the total sample at the campus.

There were no noncredit FTES and noncredit CDCP FTES associated with this finding.
Questioned Costs
$
9,352.73 \ (1.98 \text{ credit FTES exceptions} \times \$4,723.60 \text{ credit FTES reimbursement rate})
$

Extrapolated Finding
Based on the schedule of FY 2016 FTES claimed for the K-12 students enrolled in credit courses of those campuses where the samples were obtained, the following are the extrapolated FTES for the above finding:

- Los Angeles Pierce College: 4.02 FTES (17.75% x 22.64 total credit FTES claimed for K-12 students taking credit courses at the campus)
- East Los Angeles College: 40.04 FTES (4.84% x 827.30 total credit FTES claimed for K-12 students taking credit courses at the campus)

These findings have not been adjusted in the Annual Apportionment Report submitted for the year ended June 30.

Recommendation for Corrective Action
We recommend that the District strengthen controls to ensure that K-12 students who are currently enrolled in community college courses have the proper approval to attend the class in accordance with District policy.

District Response
East Los Angeles College
Effective immediately, East will restrict all enrollment of K-12 students to manual enrollment in person and place enrollment holds on students to restrict online enrollment. K-12 students will be directed to an in-person registration, in which they will either submit an initial K-12 form which would have a listing of the desired courses for immediate enrollment, or submit an updated K-12 form which would list the selected course. East will scan all K-12 forms for staff reference to verify in person registration attempts. East will also start a self-audit in the middle of semester/terms to cross check K-12 forms with actual enrollment and require students with any differences to get an updated K-12 form with the proper course listed.

Los Angeles Pierce College
The student information system automatically restricts a K-12 student from enrolling in classes at Pierce until they submit a signed K-12 supplemental form. Once the form is submitted, their hold is lifted and the K-12 student can use the online registration portal to register for class. However, the online Student Information System does not restrict the K-12 student from enrolling in classes that they may not have been approve.

Beginning Winter 2017, the Admissions and Records Office will manually verify that all K-12 students are enrolled in winter 2017 classes they have been approved to take. In cases where the student is enrolled in a class without proper approval, they will need to provide documentation or they will be removed from the class.
Beginning Spring 2017, all K-12 students must register for classes in-person. They will be no longer be able to register online. This will ensure that students are only enrolling in classes they have permission to take. Once they are enrolled in the appropriate class, a restriction hold will be placed on their record again so they will not be able to modify their class schedule online.

**S-2016.003 – To Be Arranged Hours (Section 479) – TBA Course Classification**

*State Criteria or Requirement*

TBA Definition: Some courses with regularly scheduled hours of instruction have “hours to be arranged” (TBA) as part of the total contact hours for the course. The TBA portion of the course uses an alternate method for regularly scheduling a credit course for purposes of applying either the Weekly or Daily Census Attendance Accounting Procedures pursuant to California Code of Regulations (CCR), title 5, sections 58003.1 (b) and (c), respectively.

A clear description of the course, including the number of TBA hours required, must be published in the official schedule of classes or addenda thereto.

Specific instructional activities, including those conducted during TBA hours, expected of all students enrolled in the course are included in the official course outline. All enrolled students are informed of these instructional activities and expectations for completion. Failure of the District to comply with the course approval requirements, including having a course outline of record, could result in termination of course approval.

*References*

- To Be Arranged (TBA) Hours Compliance Advice (Legal Advisory 08-02), October 1, 2008
- Second TBA Hours Follow-up Memorandum, June 10, 2009
- TBA Hours Follow-up Memorandum, January 26, 2009
- Education Code sections 84040 and 88240
- Courses with To Be Arranged (TBA) Hours, Memorandum from the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office dated March 8, 2013
- CCR, Title 5, Sections 58102 and 58104

*Identified Condition*

During the audit testing performed to ensure that apportionment claimed for TBA courses is adequately supported, we noted that:

1 out of 2 TBA courses from Los Angeles Mission College was deemed to be an invalid TBA course. The Spanish 001 Section 7844 course was created to accommodate one student who was not able to enroll in Spanish 7804 due to a time conflict. In addition, the course outline did not include a description of the TBA portion and did not classify the course as TBA. There appeared to be inadequate procedures at Los Angeles Mission College to ensure that the courses are properly classified. Course classification errors will result in
FTES per type, weekly, daily and or positive attendance, being inaccurately calculated and reported for funding.

*Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES) Impact*

Los Angeles Mission College: 0.18 FTES exceptions of the 6.48 credit FTES sampled, or 2.72% of the total sample at the campus.

There were no noncredit FTES and noncredit CDCP FTES associated with this finding.

*Questioned Costs*

$850.25 (0.18 credit FTES exceptions x $4,723.60 credit FTES reimbursement rate)

*Extrapolated Finding*

Based on the schedule of FY 2016 FTES claimed for the TBA portion of credit courses of those campuses where the samples were obtained, the following are the extrapolated FTES for the above finding:

- Los Angeles Mission College: 0.23 FTES (2.72% x 8.40 total credit FTES claimed for the TBA courses at the campus)

These findings have not been adjusted in the Annual Apportionment Report submitted for the year ended June 30, 2016.

*Recommendation for Corrective Action*

We recommend that the District strengthen controls to ensure that TBA courses are properly classified. The District should review courses classified as requiring TBA hours and determine TBA hours that do not meet the definition of Weekly or Daily Census procedure courses. Such courses should be reported as positive attendance courses.

*District Response:*

**Los Angeles Mission College**

The following remedy/remedies may be applied. However, Admissions and Records can only make suggestions because sections are created in Academic Affairs.

- One, the college will no longer create special TBA sections for any student, concurrent enrollment or otherwise, due to time conflicts or other special circumstances.
- Two, the college may wish to investigate the use of exempt or “XMPT” classes which, according to our understanding, should not have FTES implications.
- Three, the Office of Outreach and Recruitment must submit all concurrent enrollment applications by the deadline to add. This will enable the students to be informed if their schedule of classes needs to be changed.
S-2016.004 – Disabled Student Programs and Services (Section 475) – Advisory Committee Meetings

State Criteria or Requirement

Section 56050, Advisory Committee, states that each district receiving funds pursuant to this subchapter shall establish, at each college in the district, an advisory committee which shall meet not less than once per year.

The advisory committee shall, at a minimum, include students with disabilities and representatives of the disability community and agencies or organizations serving persons with disabilities.

References

- Education Code Sections 67312, 70901, and 84850
- CCR, Title 5, Section 56050
- DSPS Implementing Guideline

Identified Condition

We noted that while Los Angeles Pierce College has an Advisory Committee, the committee did not conduct an annual meeting.

Questioned Costs

Not applicable.

Recommendation for Corrective Action

We recommend that the District strengthen controls to ensure that all colleges comply with the DSPS advisory meeting requirements.

District Response

Los Angeles Pierce College

During the 2015-2016 academic year, leadership of the Special Services office was interrupted when the Associate Dean of Special Services resigned in the middle of December 2015. An Acting Associate Dean was not appointed until February 16, 2016. The Advisory Committee for the Special Services Office is usually convened during the Fall semester. The Acting Associate Dean was not made aware that the Advisory Committee had not met until it was too late in the year to gather the committee together to hold the meeting.

Upon learning that the Advisory Committee had not met, the Acting Associate Dean began efforts to reconstitute the committee and has since scheduled the next Advisory Committee meeting for December 9, 2016. Additionally, the college is preparing to conduct a search for a new Coordinator of Special Services. Once in place, the new Coordinator, in conjunction with college leadership, will ensure that an Advisory Committee meeting will be held annually every fall semester.
SCHEDULE OF PRIOR YEAR FEDERAL AND STATE FINDINGS
Except as specified in previous sections of this report, summarized below is the current status of all audit findings reported in the prior year’s schedule of audit findings and questioned costs and of any other as yet unresolved audit finding from previous years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding Reference</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Explanation if not fully implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-2015.001</td>
<td>One out of 38 students sampled with changes in enrollment status that occurred during the fiscal year was not accurately reported to NSLDS. The student graduated in Fall 2014 at Los Angeles Valley College but was reported to NSLDS as withdrawn. The District Information Technology Department is responsible for transmitting degree information to the National Clearinghouse. However, further review of Degree Transmission History to the National Clearinghouse indicates that there were no reporting made in January and February 2015.</td>
<td>Implemented.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-2015.002</td>
<td>During our review of payroll charged to the Career and Technical Education – Basic Grants to State (Perkins IV) (CTE) program at East Los Angeles College, we noted that 1 out 8 employees sampled did not have documentation of the actual time and effort the employee expended on the program. The timesheets that were provided did not reflect that the employee worked on the CTE program during the period tested.</td>
<td>Implemented.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
### Schedule of Prior Year Federal and State Findings
#### Year ended June 30, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding Reference</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Explanation if not fully implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-2015.003</td>
<td>During our audit we noted that 1 out of 18 K-12 students sampled from West Los Angeles College was enrolled in a course that was not included in the courses that were recommended and approved by the school principal to be taken by the student in the K-12 supplemental application for admission forms. There appeared to be inadequate monitoring by the District to ensure that K-12 students are enrolled only in courses that the school principal recommended and approved to be taken by the student.</td>
<td>West Los Angeles College – Implemented</td>
<td>Peoplesoft, the new student information system to be utilized by Admission and Records (A&amp;R) of all colleges, will address this audit finding. With Peoplesoft, K-12 students will be able to apply online and will be required to submit their K-12 forms directly to A&amp;R. A&amp;R will have the ability to enter the course and number, allowing only enrollment in the course and number listed on the K-12 form. This Peoplesoft feature will be available in May 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-2015.004</td>
<td>During our review of payroll charged to the Higher Education Institutional Aid Program, we noted the following: • 1 (STEM) out of 9 employees sampled at Los Angeles Mission College did not have documentation of the actual time and effort the employees expended on the program.</td>
<td>Los Angeles Mission College – Implemented</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Schedule of Prior Year Federal and State Findings
Year ended June 30, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding Reference</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Explanation if not fully implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-2015.005</td>
<td>• 3 (STEM) out of 8 employees sampled at Los Angeles Harbor College did not have documentation of the actual time and effort the employees expended on the program; and&lt;br&gt;• 1 (Title V) out of 8 employees sampled at Los Angeles Harbor College charged salary to the program more than the actual time and effort the employee expended on the program.</td>
<td>Los Angeles Mission College – Partially implemented&lt;br&gt;Los Angeles Harbor College – Implemented</td>
<td>The STEM program ended September 30, 2016 and the College could not locate the missing equipment. Moving forward the College will monitor, tag, inventory all equipment purchases. Person Responsible: Vice President of Administrative Services Anticipated Completion Date: December 31, 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During control procedures performed over equipment management, we noted that controls over equipment management were inadequate at Los Angeles Mission College and Los Angeles Harbor College. The following control deficiencies were noted:

• At Los Angeles Mission College and Los Angeles Harbor College, there was limited evidence that the results of the physical inventory were reconciled with the District’s accounting records (SAP);
### LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Schedule of Prior Year Federal and State Findings

Year ended June 30, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding Reference</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Explanation if not fully implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FS-15-001</td>
<td>During our review of the District’s information technology controls during the fiscal 2007 audit, we identified control weaknesses in the areas of security and change management. These included the sharing of user accounts, extensive super user access and informal change management processes. These issues were determined to be significant deficiencies in the District’s system of internal controls. During the fiscal 2015 audit, we evaluated the progress of the controls implemented to remediate the weaknesses identified during the audit.</td>
<td>Partially Implemented.</td>
<td>The District has implemented the controls necessary to address the super user access, change management and sharing of user accounts in the IT roles and has addressed the new Segregation of Duties issues identified in the IT Roles. The recommendation is partially implemented due to the need to do a full review of all the security roles in the business and functional areas. This will require a project with the business and process owner to resolve the findings. The business owners will review each role to ensure proper segregation of duties. This will result in a redesign</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- At Los Angeles Mission College, the condition of the equipment was missing from the equipment records as required by the federal regulations.
- The equipment listing by Los Angeles Mission College is not updated. Location information for 3 out of 6 units of sampled equipment were inaccurate.
The District has continued to made progress in remediating the previously identified issues, however control weaknesses have not been fully remediated to a level where general internal controls can be relied upon for audit purposes and the significant deficiencies continued to exist during fiscal year 2015.

The District implemented the Security Weaver tool to control access to the SAP environment, and a formal process for change management and the Mercury Quality Center application to manage its change management process. The District’s IT further limited access to super user accounts identified in the last review however, certain legacy control weaknesses, continue to exist. The sharing of user accounts in the database environment and operating system underlying SAP, extensive administrative access in SAP and weaknesses in the change management process were found during the 2015 audit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding Reference</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Explanation if not fully implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The District has continued to made progress in remediating the previously identified issues, however control weaknesses have not been fully remediated to a level where general internal controls can be relied upon for audit purposes and the significant deficiencies continued to exist during fiscal year 2015. The District implemented the Security Weaver tool to control access to the SAP environment, and a formal process for change management and the Mercury Quality Center application to manage its change management process. The District’s IT further limited access to super user accounts identified in the last review however, certain legacy control weaknesses, continue to exist. The sharing of user accounts in the database environment and operating system underlying SAP, extensive administrative access in SAP and weaknesses in the change management process were found during the 2015 audit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding Reference</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Current Status</td>
<td>Explanation if not fully implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-2015.001</td>
<td>In our sample of 40 instructors with noninstructional/reassigned assignments, we noted that noninstructional salaries for 5 instructors were included in “Salaries of Classroom Instructors.” The instructors were Department Chairs whose duties were noninstructional.</td>
<td>Implemented.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-2015.002</td>
<td>In our sample of 60 student-athletes, the Commission of Athletics Form 1 for 8 out of 20 samples selected for testing at Los Angeles Trade-Technical College could not be located. The remaining 12 samples did not participate in a sports competition during FY 14-15. There appeared to be a lack of monitoring by the District to ensure that each campus retains copies of Commission of Athletics Form 1 for student-athletes. Consequently, there was no sufficient evidence to support the assertion that the student-athletes who were claimed for state support were eligible.</td>
<td>Implemented.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding Reference</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Current Status</td>
<td>Explanation if not fully implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-2015.003</td>
<td>During our audit we noted that 1 out of 18 K-12 students sampled from West Los Angeles College was enrolled in a course that was not included in the courses that were recommended and approved by the school principal to be taken by the student in the K-12 supplemental application for admission forms. There appeared to be inadequate monitoring by the District to ensure that K-12 students are enrolled only in courses that the school principal recommended and approved to be taken by the student.</td>
<td>West Los Angeles College – Implemented Repeat Finding</td>
<td>Peoplesoft, the new student information system to be utilized by Admission and Records (A&amp;R) of all colleges, will address this audit finding. With Peoplesoft, K-12 students will be able to apply online and will be required to submit their K-12 forms directly to A&amp;R. A&amp;R will have the ability to enter the course and number, allowing only enrollment in the course and number listed on the K-12 form. This Peoplesoft feature will be available in May 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During the audit testing performed to ensure that apportionment claimed for TBA courses is adequately supported, we noted the following: - 21 TBA courses (5 from Los Angeles City College, 16 from Los Angeles Harbor College) of 46 TBA courses sampled did not have census rosters or similar attendance forms; and</td>
<td>Implemented.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding Reference</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Current Status</td>
<td>Explanation if not fully implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The attendance rosters provided for 3 TBA courses from Los Angeles City College did not adequately support the number of students claimed by the District.

There appeared to be inadequate procedures to ensure that the designation of a course as TBA is communicated to instructors, and that attendance rosters for TBA courses at these campuses are distributed to the instructors at the beginning of the class and returned to Admissions and Records when completed.

We also noted that 1 TBA course from Los Angeles Harbor College was deemed invalid TBA course. The History 58 course from Los Angeles Harbor College was an online course that used “TBA” in the schedule to indicate online format. There appeared to be inadequate procedures at Los Angeles Harbor College to ensure that the courses are properly classified. Course classification errors will result in FTES per type, weekly, daily and or positive attendance, being inaccurately calculated and reported for funding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding Reference</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Explanation if not fully implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-2015.005</td>
<td>For EOPS, we noted 1 (West Los Angeles College) of 3 colleges sampled did not have evidence of the required annual meeting. For CARE, we noted that 1 (West Los Angeles College) of 3 colleges sampled did not meet the required semi-annual meetings. There were no meetings held during the academic year.</td>
<td>Implemented.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-2015.006</td>
<td>We noted that Los Angeles Trade-Technical College did not have evidence of the required annual meeting of the Advisory Committee.</td>
<td>Implemented.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
PROPOSITION A BOND CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Statement of Expenditures of Bond Proceeds
and Unaudited Supplementary Schedule

Year ended June 30, 2016

(With Independent Auditors’ Report Thereon)
# Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Auditors’ Report</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Expenditures of Bond Proceeds</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes to Statement of Expenditures of Bond Proceeds</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaudited Supplementary Schedule of Expenditures of Bond Proceeds</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes to Unaudited Supplementary Schedule of Expenditures of Bond Proceeds</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Auditors’ Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting and on Compliance and Other Matters Based on an Audit of Proposition A Bond Construction Program Statement of Expenditures of Bond Proceeds Performed in Accordance With Government Auditing Standards</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Independent Auditors’ Report

The Honorable Board of Trustees
Los Angeles Community College District
Los Angeles, California:

Report on the Statement
We have audited the accompanying statement of expenditures of bond proceeds of the Proposition A Bond Construction Program of the Los Angeles Community College District (the District) for the year ended June 30, 2016, and the related notes to the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds.

Management’s Responsibility for the Statement
Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of this statement in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles; this includes the design, implementation, and maintenance of internal control relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds that is free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

Auditors’ Responsibility
Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds 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 statement of expenditures of bond proceeds is free from material misstatement.

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

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

Opinion on the Statement of Expenditures of Bond Proceeds
In our opinion, the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds referred to above presents fairly, in all material respects, the expenditures of the Los Angeles Community College District’s Proposition A Bond Construction Program for the year ended June 30, 2016, in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles.
Other Matters

Purpose of Report

As described in note 2 to the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds, the accompanying statement of expenditures of bond proceeds was prepared to comply with the requirements of California’s Proposition 39, Smaller Classes, Safer Schools and Financial Accountability Act.

Supplementary and Other Information

Our audit was conducted for the purpose of forming an opinion on the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds of the Proposition A Bond Construction Program. The accompanying supplementary schedule of expenditures of bond proceeds of the Proposition A Bond Construction Program of the District for the period from April 10, 2001 (inception) through June 30, 2016 is presented for purposes of additional analysis and is not a required part of the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds.

The supplementary schedule of expenditures of bond proceeds has not been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds, and accordingly, we do not express an opinion or provide any assurance on it.

Other Reporting Required by Government Auditing Standards

In accordance with Government Auditing Standards, we have also issued our report dated December 7, 2016, on our consideration of the District’s internal control over financial reporting and on our tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements and other matters. The purpose of this 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. This report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with Government Auditing Standards in considering the District’s internal control over financial reporting and compliance.

December 7, 2016
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT  
PROPOSITION A BOND CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM  
Statement of Expenditures of Bond Proceeds  
Year ended June 30, 2016  

College direct costs:  
  Structural and equipment costs:  
    Construction (new) $1,490,207  
    Construction (renovation) 3,127,209  
    Temporary facilities 320,236  
    Furniture, fixtures, and equipment 25,215  
    Total structural and equipment costs 4,962,867  
  Development and support costs:  
    Master planning 10,836  
    Design 803,956  
    Specialty consulting 34,943  
    Project management 516,752  
    Inspection and testing 46,401  
    Reimbursable expenditures 2,288  
    Total development and support costs 1,415,176  
  Total college direct costs 6,378,043  

Programwide costs:  
  Program management 921,947  
  Compliance and audit fees 25,000  
  Total programwide costs 946,947  
  Total college direct costs and programwide costs $7,324,990  

See accompanying notes to statement of expenditures of bond proceeds.
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
PROPOSITION A BOND CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Notes to Statement of Expenditures of Bond Proceeds
Year ended June 30, 2016

(1) Program Background
In April 2001, the Los Angeles Community College District (the District) became the first community college district in the State of California to pass a property tax financed bond (Proposition A) under the requirements of the Proposition 39, Smaller Classes, Safer Schools and Financial Accountability Act, of the State of California (the Act). Passed by voters at a value of $1.245 billion, the District’s Proposition A Bond Construction Program (the Program) was one of the largest community college bonds ever passed in California. The bond measure was designed to implement a capital improvement program for each of the nine colleges within the District.

The Program is intended to increase educational opportunities, raise student achievement, and improve health and safety conditions on the campuses of the nine colleges within the District through the replacement and/or repair and rehabilitation of deteriorating buildings; the construction, furnishing, and equipping of classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related facilities; the repair and upgrading of electrical wiring for computer technology, heating, air conditioning, and plumbing; complete earthquake retrofitting; improvement of campus safety, fire security, parking, and lighting; and the improvement of current or to be acquired real property to relieve overcrowding of the facilities on these campuses.

In August 2001, the District’s board of trustees approved an award of the contract for program management (Program Manager) services to Daniel, Mann, Johnson & Mendenhall/Jenkins/Gales & Martinez, Inc. (DMJM/JGM). Effective April 12, 2007, DMJM/JGM was replaced by a new Program Manager, URS Corporation. Effective April 4, 2013, URS Corporation was replaced by a new Program Manager, AECOM.

The Program Manager is responsible for managing all program related activities, including the maintenance of the master schedule and the master program budget. The Program Manager provides its own staff and services for budgeting, accounting, contracting, and supervising the program. The annual contract amount paid to the Program Manager related to the Proposition A Bond Construction Program totaled $552,468 for the year ended June 30, 2016.

(2) Basis of Presentation
The accompanying statement of expenditures of bond proceeds for the year ended June 30, 2016 has been prepared on the accrual basis of accounting. The Act requires an annual, independent financial audit of the expenditures of proceeds from the sale of the school facilities bonds until all of the proceeds have been expended. Accordingly, the accompanying statement of expenditures of bond proceeds includes all amounts expended using bond proceeds regardless of expenditure type.

(3) Bond Issuances
On April 10, 2001, the voters of the County passed Proposition A, a $1.2 billion General Obligation (G.O.) Bond Measure.
UNAUDITED SUPPLEMENTARY SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF BOND PROCEEDS
# LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
PROPOSITION A BOND CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Unaudited Supplementary Schedule of Expenditures of Bond Proceeds
Period from May 20, 2003 (inception) through June 30, 2016
(Unaudited)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College direct costs:</th>
<th>2016 Budget</th>
<th>June 30, 2016</th>
<th>Reclassifications</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Cumulative expenditures of bond proceeds for the period from April 10, 2001 (inception) through June 30, 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural and equipment costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (new)</td>
<td>597,765,175</td>
<td>696,614,512</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>696,614,512</td>
<td>(112,831,827) 583,782,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (renovation)</td>
<td>219,394,678</td>
<td>216,464,194</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>216,464,194</td>
<td>(15,420,311) 201,043,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardscape/landscape</td>
<td>44,105</td>
<td>125,771</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>125,771</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary facilities</td>
<td>16,729,415</td>
<td>19,884,056</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19,884,056</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture, fixtures, and equipment</td>
<td>34,608,083</td>
<td>46,382,885</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46,382,885</td>
<td>(13,912,971) 32,469,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total structural and equipment costs</td>
<td>868,531,456</td>
<td>979,471,418</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>979,471,418</td>
<td>(142,265,109) 837,206,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land acquisition</td>
<td>41,034,151</td>
<td>43,869,570</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43,869,570</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and support costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master planning/EIR</td>
<td>14,464,771</td>
<td>15,259,710</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,259,710</td>
<td>(186,299) 15,073,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predesign/programming</td>
<td>8,121,142</td>
<td>8,443,216</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,443,216</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>128,043,410</td>
<td>138,225,473</td>
<td>54,272</td>
<td>182,703,745</td>
<td>(7,026,739) 131,253,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty consulting</td>
<td>39,849,493</td>
<td>40,696,353</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40,696,353</td>
<td>(222,510) 40,473,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management</td>
<td>113,911,719</td>
<td>114,926,738</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>114,926,738</td>
<td>(325,165) 114,601,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection and testing</td>
<td>34,670,271</td>
<td>34,934,320</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>34,934,768</td>
<td>(889,599) 34,044,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction management</td>
<td>470,516</td>
<td>523,943</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>523,943</td>
<td>(401,473) 122,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursable expenditures</td>
<td>10,137,052</td>
<td>6,306,711</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,306,711</td>
<td>(34,803) 6,271,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total development and support costs</td>
<td>349,668,374</td>
<td>359,316,464</td>
<td>54,720</td>
<td>359,371,184</td>
<td>(9,083,588) 350,287,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total college direct costs</td>
<td>1,259,233,981</td>
<td>1,382,657,452</td>
<td>54,720</td>
<td>1,382,712,172</td>
<td>(151,348,697) 1,231,363,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programwide costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program management</td>
<td>76,637,053</td>
<td>78,882,395</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78,882,395</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal consulting fees</td>
<td>5,802,250</td>
<td>5,767,366</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,767,366</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance and audit fees</td>
<td>2,830,603</td>
<td>2,455,970</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,455,970</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond measure election costs</td>
<td>523,743</td>
<td>585,660</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>585,660</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents and leases</td>
<td>653,481</td>
<td>1,281,244</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,281,244</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total programwide costs</td>
<td>86,447,130</td>
<td>88,972,635</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>88,972,635</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total college direct costs and programwide costs</td>
<td>1,345,681,111</td>
<td>1,471,630,087</td>
<td>54,720</td>
<td>1,471,684,807</td>
<td>(151,348,697) 1,320,336,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated interest earned</td>
<td>16,484,906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,484,906</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total college direct costs, programwide costs, and unallocated interest earned</td>
<td>$ 1,362,166,017</td>
<td>$ 1,471,630,087</td>
<td>54,720</td>
<td>1,471,684,807</td>
<td>(151,348,697) 1,320,336,110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See accompanying notes to unaudited supplementary schedule of expenditures of bond proceeds.
(1) **Background**

The unaudited supplementary schedule of expenditures of bond proceeds presents expenditures for the period from April 10, 2001 (inception) through June 30, 2016.

(2) **Basis of Presentation**

The accompanying unaudited supplementary schedule of expenditures of bond proceeds has been prepared on the accrual basis of accounting. The Proposition 39, *Smaller Classes, Safer Schools and Financial Accountability Act*, of the State of California (the Act) requires an annual, independent financial audit of the proceeds from the sale of the school facilities bonds until all of the expenditures of proceeds have been expended. Accordingly, the accompanying unaudited statement of expenditures of bond proceeds includes all amounts expended using bond proceeds, regardless of expenditure type, since inception.

The unaudited supplementary schedule of expenditures of bond proceeds includes the following:

(a) **Budget**

The amounts included within the budget column in the accompanying unaudited supplementary schedule of expenditures of bond proceeds represent reasonable estimates of the costs that will be expended to complete the various projects at each of the Los Angeles Community College District's (the District) colleges.

(b) **Cumulative Expenditures**

The amounts included within the cumulative expenditures of bond proceeds in the accompanying unaudited supplementary schedule of expenditures of bond proceeds may include reclassifications and reimbursements from other funding sources for the period from April 10, 2001 (inception) through June 30, 2016.

(c) **Interest Earned**

Interest earned on bond issuances that has not been expended is added to project budgets upon approval by the District. Interest earned that has not yet been approved for specific projects is included in unallocated interest earned.

(d) **Cumulative Reimbursements from the State of California**

During the period from April 10, 2001 (inception) through June 30, 2016, the District received amounts from the State of California and other non-Proposition A funding sources as reimbursement for various multifunded projects. These projects were to be funded by both state funds and bond proceeds. Prior to filing claims and receipt of funds from the state, eligible Proposition A bond proceeds were used to fund the projects. The reimbursements received by the District, totaling $151,348,697 for the period from April 10, 2001 (inception) through June 30, 2016, have been reflected in the accompanying unaudited supplementary schedule of expenditures of bond proceeds as a reduction of expenditures made with bond proceeds by cost classification on a cumulative basis.
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
PROPOSITION A BOND CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Notes to Unaudited Supplementary Schedule of Expenditures of Bond Proceeds
Period from April 10, 2001 (inception) through June 30, 2016
(Unaudited)

(e) Reclassifications

Certain adjustments and reclassifications were made between the District’s various Proposition 39 bond programs during the year ended June 30, 2016, which were related to prior years. Such amounts totaling $54,720 were reclassified from Proposition A to Measure J and Proposition AA.

(3) Reconciliation of Bond Proceeds

The following is a summary of total authorized and issued bond funds and other bond related sources of funds available at June 30, 2016:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonds authorized and issued</td>
<td>$1,245,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other bond related sources of funds:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional proceeds from General Obligation Refunding Bonds, 2005 Series A</td>
<td>12,330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>743,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest earned for the period from April 10, 2001 (inception) through June 30, 2016</td>
<td>104,092,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total bonds authorized, interest earned, and other</td>
<td>1,362,166,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less expenditures of bond proceeds for the period from April 20, 2001 (inception) through June 30, 2016</td>
<td>(1,320,336,110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total authorized and issued bond funds and other bond related sources of funds available at June 30, 2016</td>
<td>$41,829,907</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Independent Auditors’ Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting and on Compliance and Other Matters Based on an Audit of Proposition A Bond Construction Program Statement of Expenditures of Bond Proceeds Performed in Accordance with Government Auditing Standards

The Honorable Board of Trustees
Los Angeles Community College District
Los Angeles, 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 Proposition A Bond Construction Program statement of expenditures of bond proceeds (statement of expenditures of bond proceeds) of the Los Angeles Community College District (the District), for the year ended June 30, 2016, and have issued our report thereon dated December 7, 2016.

Internal Control over Financial Reporting

In planning and performing our audit of the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds, we considered the 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 statement of expenditures of bond proceeds, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the District’s internal control. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the 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 the District’s statement of expenditures of bond proceeds will not be prevented, or detected and corrected, on a timely basis. A significant deficiency is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control that is less severe than a material weakness, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance.

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

Compliance and Other Matters

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds is free from material misstatement, we performed tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations and contracts, noncompliance with which could have a direct and material effect on the determination of statement amounts. However, providing an opinion on compliance with those provisions was not an objective of our audit, and accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. The results of our tests disclosed no instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under Government Auditing Standards.
Purpose of this Report

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

(signed) KPMG LLP

December 7, 2016
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
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Independent Auditors’ Report

The Honorable Board of Trustees
Los Angeles Community College District
    Los Angeles, California:

Report on the Statement

We have audited the accompanying statement of expenditures of bond proceeds of the Proposition AA Bond Construction Program of the Los Angeles Community College District (the District) for the year ended June 30, 2016, and the related notes to the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds.

Management’s Responsibility for the Statement

Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of this statement in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles; this includes the design, implementation, and maintenance of internal control relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds that is free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

Auditors’ Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds 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 statement of expenditures of bond proceeds is free from material misstatement.

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

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

Opinion on the Statement

In our opinion, the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds referred to above presents fairly, in all material respects, the expenditures of the Los Angeles Community College District’s Proposition AA Bond Construction Program for the year ended June 30, 2016, in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles.
Other Matters

Purpose of Report
As described in note 2 to the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds, the accompanying statement of expenditures of bond proceeds was prepared to comply with the requirements of California’s Proposition 39, Smaller Classes, Safer Schools and Financial Accountability Act.

Supplementary and Other Information
Our audit was conducted for the purpose of forming an opinion on the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds of the Proposition AA Bond Construction Program. The accompanying supplementary schedule of expenditures of bond proceeds of the Proposition AA Bond Construction Program of the District for the period from May 20, 2003 (inception) through June 30, 2016, is presented for purposes of additional analysis and is not a required part of the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds.

The supplementary schedule of expenditures of bond proceeds has not been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds, and accordingly, we do not express an opinion or provide any assurance on it.

Other Reporting Required by Government Auditing Standards
In accordance with Government Auditing Standards, we have also issued our report dated December 7, 2016, on our consideration of the District’s internal control over financial reporting and on our tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements and other matters. The purpose of this 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. This report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with Government Auditing Standards in considering the District’s internal control over financial reporting and compliance.

December 7, 2016
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT  
PROPOSITION AA BOND CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM  
Statement of Expenditures of Bond Proceeds  
Year ended June 30, 2016  

College direct costs:  
Structural and equipment costs:  
- Construction (new) $1,270,057  
- Construction (renovation) 2,768,455  
- Furniture, fixtures, and equipment 55,587  
  Total structural and equipment costs 4,094,099  

Development and support costs:  
- Master planning 5,748  
- Design 874,746  
- Specialty consulting 74,244  
- Project management 413,697  
- Inspection and testing 196,921  
- Reimbursable expenditures 8,258  
  Total development and support costs 1,573,614  

Total college direct costs 5,667,713  

Programwide costs:  
- Program management 822,549  
- Compliance and audit fees 45,000  
  Total programwide costs 867,549  

Total college direct costs and programwide costs $6,535,262  

See accompanying notes to statement of expenditures of bond proceeds.
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
PROPOSITION AA BOND CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM
Notes to Statement of Expenditures of Bond Proceeds
Year ended June 30, 2016

(1) Program Background
In May 2003, the Los Angeles Community College District (the District) electorate approved the passage of a $980 million property tax financed bond measure under the requirements of the Proposition 39, Smaller Classes, Safer Schools and Financial Accountability Act, of the State of California (the Act), known as Proposition AA (the Program). This Program was intended to supplement the District’s $1.245 billion Proposition A Bond Construction Program of the nine college master plans. The college master plans identify areas for improvement needed to prepare the colleges to meet the future needs of the community and provide a time line for addressing those needs within the next 10 years.

The Program is intended to prepare students for jobs and four-year colleges; train nurses, police, firefighters, and emergency medical personnel; improve health, safety, and security conditions on the campuses of the nine colleges within the District through the construction of computer technology centers to train students for high tech jobs; repair deteriorating classrooms, science laboratories, and libraries; expand educational centers in underserved communities; upgrade heating, plumbing, wiring, roofs, sewers, energy efficiency, and water conservation; improve campus environmental standards, safety, lighting, fire alarms, sprinklers, intercoms, and fire doors; and acquire/improve real property and/or build new classrooms to relieve overcrowding.

The District’s board of trustees approved an award of the contract for program management (Program Manager) services to Daniel, Mann, Johnson & Mendenhall/Jenkins/Gales & Martinez, Inc. (DMJM/JGM). Effective April 12, 2007, DMJM/JGM was replaced by a new Program Manager, URS Corporation. Effective April 4, 2013, URS Corporation was replaced by a new Program Manager, AECOM.

The Program Manager is responsible for managing all program-related activities, including the maintenance of the master schedule and the master program budget. The Program Manager provides its own staff and services for budgeting, accounting, contracting, and supervising the program. The annual contract amount paid to the Program Manager related to the Proposition AA Bond Construction Program totaled $492,042 for the year ended June 30, 2016.

(2) Basis of Presentation
The accompanying statement of expenditures of bond proceeds for the year ended June 30, 2016, has been prepared on the accrual basis of accounting. The Act requires an annual, independent financial audit of the expenditures of proceeds from the sale of the school facilities bonds until all of the proceeds have been expended. Accordingly, the accompanying statement of expenditures of bond proceeds includes all amounts expended using bond proceeds regardless of expenditure type.

(3) Bond Issuances
On June 11, 2013, the District issued the 2013 Refunding Bonds (Proposition AA) in the amount of $55.7 million with interest rates ranging from 2% to 5%, maturing in 2028. This issuance refunded $62.9 million of the 2003 Series B G.O. Bonds (Proposition AA).
UNAUDITED SUPPLEMENTARY SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF BOND PROCEEDS
# LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
## PROPOSITION AA BOND CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM
### Unaudited Supplementary Schedule of Expenditures of Bond Proceeds

Period from May 20, 2003 (inception) through June 30, 2016  
(Unaudited)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2016 Budget</th>
<th>June 30, 2016</th>
<th>Reclassifications</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Cumulative expenditures of bond proceeds for the period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College direct costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural and equipment costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (new)</td>
<td>$333,668,792</td>
<td>371,642,666</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>371,642,666</td>
<td>(54,532,541) 317,110,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (renovation)</td>
<td>202,336,839</td>
<td>225,554,449</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>225,554,449</td>
<td>(41,868,842) 183,685,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary facilities</td>
<td>6,306,266</td>
<td>4,615,240</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4,615,240</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture, fixtures, and equipment</td>
<td>35,405,294</td>
<td>37,770,255</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>37,770,255</td>
<td>(2,828,479) 34,941,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total structural and equipment costs</td>
<td>577,717,191</td>
<td>639,582,610</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>639,582,610</td>
<td>(99,229,862) 540,352,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land acquisition</td>
<td>116,105,679</td>
<td>103,353,733</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>103,353,733</td>
<td>— 103,353,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building acquisition</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>19,704,402</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>19,704,402</td>
<td>— 19,704,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total other costs</td>
<td>116,105,679</td>
<td>123,058,135</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>123,058,135</td>
<td>— 123,058,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and support costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master planning/EIR</td>
<td>5,029,516</td>
<td>4,454,527</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4,454,527</td>
<td>— 4,454,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predesign/programming</td>
<td>1,270,326</td>
<td>1,222,490</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,222,490</td>
<td>— 1,222,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>65,631,947</td>
<td>72,244,770</td>
<td>(43,429)</td>
<td>72,201,341</td>
<td>(9,255,502) 62,945,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty consulting</td>
<td>31,161,787</td>
<td>30,810,388</td>
<td>15,030</td>
<td>30,825,418</td>
<td>(80,910) 30,744,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management</td>
<td>74,537,177</td>
<td>73,384,853</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>73,384,853</td>
<td>— 73,384,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection and testing</td>
<td>23,024,867</td>
<td>22,242,983</td>
<td>2,147</td>
<td>22,245,130</td>
<td>(180,024) 22,065,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction management</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>— 1,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursable expenditures</td>
<td>5,863,911</td>
<td>2,943,321</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,943,321</td>
<td>(754,703) 2,188,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total development and support costs</td>
<td>206,525,331</td>
<td>207,304,939</td>
<td>(26,252)</td>
<td>207,278,687</td>
<td>(10,271,139) 197,007,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total college direct costs</td>
<td>900,348,201</td>
<td>969,945,684</td>
<td>(26,252)</td>
<td>969,919,432</td>
<td>(109,501,001) 860,418,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programwide costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program management</td>
<td>36,026,633</td>
<td>41,282,895</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>41,282,895</td>
<td>— 41,282,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal consulting fees</td>
<td>1,174,092</td>
<td>1,158,475</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,158,475</td>
<td>— 1,158,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance and audit fees</td>
<td>1,358,336</td>
<td>1,259,680</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,259,680</td>
<td>— 1,259,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond measure election costs</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>1,206,719</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,206,719</td>
<td>— 1,206,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents and leases</td>
<td>5,986,183</td>
<td>6,062,392</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6,062,392</td>
<td>— 6,062,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total programwide costs</td>
<td>44,595,244</td>
<td>50,970,161</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>50,970,161</td>
<td>— 50,970,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total college direct costs and programwide costs</td>
<td>1,052,246,934</td>
<td>1,130,801,870</td>
<td>(26,252)</td>
<td>1,130,775,618</td>
<td>(109,501,001) 1,021,274,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated interest earned</td>
<td>8,071,184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total college direct costs, programwide costs, and unallocated interest earned</td>
<td>$1,060,318,118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See accompanying notes to unaudited supplementary schedule of expenditures of bond proceeds.
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
PROPOSITION AA BOND CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Notes to Unaudited Supplementary Schedule of Expenditures of Bond Proceeds
Period from May 20, 2003 (inception) through June 30, 2016
(Unaudited)

(1) Background
The unaudited supplementary schedule of expenditures of bond proceeds presents expenditures for the period from May 20, 2003 (inception) through June 30, 2016.

(2) Basis of Presentation
The accompanying unaudited schedule of expenditures of bond proceeds has been prepared on the accrual basis of accounting. The Proposition 39, Smaller Classes, Safer Schools and Financial Accountability Act, of the State of California (the Act) requires an annual, independent financial audit of the expenditures of proceeds from the sale of the school facilities bonds until all of the proceeds have been expended. Accordingly, the accompanying unaudited statement of expenditures of bond proceeds includes all amounts expended using bond proceeds regardless of expenditure type, since inception.

The unaudited supplementary schedule of expenditures of bond proceeds includes the following:

(a) Budget
The amounts included within the budget column in the accompanying unaudited supplementary schedule of expenditures of bond proceeds represent reasonable estimates of the costs that will be expended to complete the various projects at each of the Los Angeles Community College District’s (the District) colleges.

(b) Cumulative Expenditures
The amounts included within the cumulative expenditures of bond proceeds in the accompanying unaudited supplementary schedule of expenditures of bond proceeds may include reclassifications and reimbursements from other funding sources for the period from May 20, 2003 (inception) through June 30, 2016.

(c) Interest Earned
Interest earned on bond issuances that has not been expended is added to project budgets upon approval by the District. Interest earned that has not yet been approved for specific projects is included in unallocated interest earned.

(d) Cumulative Reimbursements from the State of California
During the period from May 20, 2003 (inception) through June 30, 2016, the District received amounts from the State of California as reimbursement for various multifunded projects. These projects were to be funded by both state funds and bond proceeds. Prior to filing claims and receipt of funds from the state, eligible Proposition AA bond proceeds were used to fund the projects. The reimbursements received by the District, totaling $109,501,001 for period from May 20, 2003 (inception) through June 30, 2016, have been reflected in the accompanying unaudited supplementary schedule of expenditures of bond proceeds as a reduction of expenditures made with bond proceeds by cost classification on a cumulative basis.
(e) **Reclassifications**

Certain adjustments and reclassifications were made between the District’s various Proposition 39 bond programs during the year ended June 30, 2016, which were related to prior years. Such amounts totaling $26,253 were reclassified to Proposition AA funds from Measure J and Proposition A.

(3) **Reconciliation of Bond Proceeds**

The following is a summary of total authorized and issued bond funds available at June 30, 2016:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonds authorized and issued</td>
<td>$980,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other bond related sources of funds:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest earned from May 20, 2003 (inception) through June 30, 2016</td>
<td>$45,896,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from sale of property purchased with bond funds</td>
<td>$29,974,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other income</td>
<td>$4,447,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total other bond related sources of funds</td>
<td>$1,060,318,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less expenditures of bonds proceeds for the period from May 20, 2003 (inception) through June 30, 2016</td>
<td>$(1,021,274,617)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total authorized and issued bond funds available at June 30, 2016</td>
<td>$39,043,501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Independent Auditors’ Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting and on Compliance and Other Matters Based on an Audit of Proposition AA Bond Construction Program Statement of Expenditures of Bond Proceeds Performed in Accordance With Government Auditing Standards

The Honorable Board of Trustees
Los Angeles Community College District
Los Angeles, 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 Proposition AA Bond Construction Program statement of expenditures of bond proceeds (statement of expenditures of bond proceeds) of the Los Angeles Community College District (the District), for the year ended June 30, 2016, and have issued our report thereon dated December 7, 2016.

Internal Control over Financial Reporting

In planning and performing our audit of the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds, we considered the 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 statement of expenditures of bond proceeds, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the District’s internal control. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the 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 the District’s statement of expenditures of bond proceeds will not be prevented, or detected and corrected, on a timely basis. A significant deficiency is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control that is less severe than a material weakness, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance.

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

Compliance and Other Matters

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds is free from material misstatement, we performed tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations and contracts, noncompliance with which could have a direct and material effect on the determination of statement amounts. However, providing an opinion on compliance with those provisions was not an objective of our audit, and accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. The results of our tests disclosed no instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under Government Auditing Standards.
Purpose of this Report

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

December 7, 2016

(signed) KPMG LLP
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
MEASURE J BOND CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Statement of Expenditures of Bond Proceeds
and Unaudited Supplementary Schedule

Year ended June 30, 2016

(With Independent Auditors’ Report Thereon)
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Independent Auditors’ Report

The Honorable Board of Trustees
Los Angeles Community College District
Los Angeles, California:

Report on the Statement
We have audited the accompanying statement of expenditures of bond proceeds of the Measure J Bond Construction Program of the Los Angeles Community College District (the District) for the year ended June 30, 2016, and the related notes to the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds.

Management’s Responsibility for the Statement
Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of this statement in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles; this includes the design, implementation, and maintenance of internal control relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds that is free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

Auditors’ Responsibility
Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds 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 statement of expenditures of bond proceeds is free from material misstatement.

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

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

Opinion on the Statement
In our opinion, the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds referred to above presents fairly, in all material respects, the expenditures of the Los Angeles Community College District’s Measure J Bond Construction Program for the year ended June 30, 2016, in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles.
Other Matters

Purpose of Report
As described in note 2 to the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds, the accompanying statement of expenditures of bond proceeds was prepared to comply with the requirements of California’s Proposition 39, Smaller Classes, Safer Schools, and Financial Accountability Act.

Supplementary and Other Information
Our audit was conducted for the purpose of forming an opinion on the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds of the Measure J Bond Construction Program. The accompanying supplementary schedule of expenditures of bond proceeds of the Measure J Bond Construction Program of the District for the period from November 4, 2008 (inception) through June 30, 2016, is presented for purposes of additional analysis, and is not a required part of the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds.

The supplementary schedule of expenditures of bond proceeds has not been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds, and accordingly, we do not express an opinion or provide any assurance on it.

Other Reporting Required by Government Auditing Standards
In accordance with Government Auditing Standards, we have also issued our report dated December 7, 2016, on our consideration of the District’s internal control over financial reporting and on our tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts and grant agreements, and other matters. The purpose of this 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. This report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with Government Auditing Standards in considering the District’s internal control over financial reporting and compliance.

December 7, 2016

(signed) KPMG LLP
## LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
### MEASURE J BOND CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

#### Statement of Expenditures of Bond Proceeds

Year ended June 30, 2016

---

**College direct costs:**

**Structural and equipment costs:**
- **Construction (new)**: $126,515,342
- **Construction (renovation)**: $53,939,848
- **Temporary facilities**: $1,230,542
- **Furniture, fixtures, and equipment**: $9,508,788

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total structural and equipment costs</strong></td>
<td>$191,194,520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Development and support costs:**
- **Master planning**: $136,789
- **Predesign/programming**: $67,583
- **Design**: $15,097,942
- **Specialty consulting**: $4,029,307
- **Project management**: $14,931,384
- **Inspection and testing**: $5,147,991
- **Reimbursable expenditures**: $175,302

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total development and support costs</strong></td>
<td>$39,586,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total college direct costs</strong></td>
<td>$230,780,818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Programwide costs:**
- **Program management**: $34,297,169
- **Legal consulting fees**: $3,551,279
- **Compliance and audit fees**: $542,488
- **Rents and leases**: $3,323,803

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total programwide costs</strong></td>
<td>$41,714,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total college direct costs and programwide costs</strong></td>
<td>$272,495,557</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

See accompanying notes to statement of expenditures of bond proceeds.
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
MEASURE J BOND CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Notes to Statement of Expenditures of Bond Proceeds

Year ended June 30, 2016

(1) Program Background

In November 2008, the Los Angeles Community College District (the District) electorate approved the passage of a $3.5 billion property tax financed bond measure under the requirements of the Proposition 39, Smaller Classes, Safer Schools and Financial Accountability Act, of the State of California (the Act), known as Measure J (the Program). This Program was intended to supplement the District’s cumulative $2.225 billion Proposition AA and A Bond Construction Programs of the nine college master plans. The college master plans identify areas for improvements needed to prepare the colleges to meet the future needs of the community and provide a time line for addressing those needs within the next 10 years.

The program is intended to increase educational opportunities, raise student achievement, and improve health and safety conditions on the campuses of the nine colleges within the District through the replacement and/or repair and rehabilitation of deteriorating buildings; the construction, furnishing, and equipping of classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related facilities; the repair and upgrading of electrical wiring for computer technology, heating, air conditioning, and plumbing; complete earthquake retrofitting; improvement of campus safety, fire security, parking, and lighting; and the improvement of current or to be acquired real property to relieve overcrowding of the facilities on these campuses.

The District’s board of trustees approved an award of the contract for program management (Program Manager) services to Daniel, Mann, Johnson & Mendenhall/Jenkins/Gales & Martinez, Inc. (DMJM/JGM). Effective April 12, 2007, DMJM/JGM was replaced by a new Program Manager, URS Corporation. Effective April 4, 2013, URS Corporation was replaced by a new Program Manager, AECOM.

The Program Manager is responsible for managing all program-related activities, including the maintenance of the master schedule and the master program budget. The Program Manager provides its own staff and services for budgeting, accounting, contracting, and supervising the program. The annual contract amount paid to the Program Manager related to the Measure J Bond Construction Program totaled $20,246,619 for the year ended June 30, 2016.

(2) Basis of Presentation

The accompanying statement of expenditures of bond proceeds for the year ended June 30, 2016 has been prepared on the accrual basis of accounting. The Act requires an annual, independent financial audit of the expenditures of proceeds from the sale of the school facilities bonds until all of the proceeds have been expended. Accordingly, the accompanying statement of expenditures of bond proceeds includes all amounts expended using bond proceeds regardless of expenditure type.

(3) Bond Issuances

On November 4, 2008, the voters of the Los Angeles County (the County) passed Measure J, a $3.5 billion G.O. Bond measure. The bond measure was designed to finance construction, building acquisition, equipment, and improvement of college and support facilities at the various campuses of the District.

On March 19, 2009, the District issued the 2009 Series A G.O. Bonds (Measure J) in the amount of $350,000,000 and the 2009 Taxable Series B G.O. Bonds (Measure J) in the amount of $75,000,000 with various interest rates ranging from 4.50% to 7.53%, maturing in 2034.
On July 22, 2010, the District issued $900,000,000 aggregate principal amount in G.O. Bonds, 2008 Election (Measure J) 2010 Series E Build America Bonds with 6.60% and 6.75% interest rates, maturing in 2049. The proceeds are to be used to finance the construction, equipping, and improving of college and support facilities at nine colleges.

On August 10, 2010, the District issued $175,000,000 aggregate principal amount in G.O. Bonds, 2008 Election (Measure J) 2010 Series C with 5.25% interest rate, maturing in 2039. On August 10, 2010, the District issued $125,000,000 aggregate principal amount in G.O. Bonds, 2008 Election (Measure J) 2010 Taxable Series D with 6.68% interest rate, maturing in 2036. The proceeds from these two issues were used to pay off the bond anticipation notes (BAN) payable of $300,000,000 received in June 2010.

On June 11, 2013, the District issued the 2013 Series F G.O. Bonds (Measure J) in the amount of $250 million with interest rates ranging from 2% to 5%, maturing in 2038.

On January 1, 2015, the District issued $300,000,000 in G.O. Bonds, 2008 Election (Measure J) 2010 Series G with interest range from 2% to 5%, maturing in August 2039. On January 1, 2015, the District issued $50,000,000 in G.O. Bonds, 2008 Election (Measure J) 2010 Series H with interest 0.297%, maturing in August 2015.
UNAUDITED SUPPLEMENTARY SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF BOND PROCEEDS
## Unaudited Supplementary Schedule of Expenditures of Bond Proceeds

Period from November 4, 2008 (inception) through June 30, 2016
(Unaudited)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>College direct costs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural and equipment costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (new)</td>
<td>$1,441,116,973</td>
<td>827,399,702</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>827,399,702</td>
<td>(17,665,447)</td>
<td>809,734,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (renovation)</td>
<td>696,802,992</td>
<td>450,063,569</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>450,063,569</td>
<td>(6,675,609)</td>
<td>443,387,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardscape/landscape</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>193,527</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>193,527</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>193,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary facilities</td>
<td>10,264,675</td>
<td>8,842,033</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8,842,033</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8,842,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture, fixtures, and equipment</td>
<td>172,027,918</td>
<td>107,904,847</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>107,904,847</td>
<td>(2,587,093)</td>
<td>105,317,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total structural and equipment costs</td>
<td>2,320,212,558</td>
<td>1,394,403,678</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,394,403,678</td>
<td>(26,928,149)</td>
<td>1,367,475,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other costs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land acquisition</td>
<td>59,613,089</td>
<td>82,543,820</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>82,543,820</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>82,543,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development and support costs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master planning/EIR</td>
<td>6,642,034</td>
<td>5,843,619</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5,843,619</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5,843,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predesign/programming</td>
<td>6,594,124</td>
<td>5,003,717</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5,003,717</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5,003,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>268,328,941</td>
<td>216,261,675</td>
<td>(10,843)</td>
<td>216,271,032</td>
<td>(554,000)</td>
<td>215,717,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty consulting</td>
<td>257,857,423</td>
<td>189,419,621</td>
<td>(15,030)</td>
<td>189,404,591</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>189,404,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management</td>
<td>195,454,372</td>
<td>151,917,567</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>151,917,567</td>
<td>(281,460)</td>
<td>151,636,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection and testing</td>
<td>68,052,286</td>
<td>40,421,320</td>
<td>(2,594)</td>
<td>40,418,726</td>
<td>(146,535)</td>
<td>40,272,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction management</td>
<td>305,217</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursable expenditures</td>
<td>6,261,814</td>
<td>4,771,688</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4,771,688</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4,771,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total development and support costs</td>
<td>809,496,211</td>
<td>613,659,407</td>
<td>(28,467)</td>
<td>613,630,940</td>
<td>(981,995)</td>
<td>612,648,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total college direct costs</strong></td>
<td>3,189,321,858</td>
<td>2,090,606,905</td>
<td>(28,467)</td>
<td>2,090,578,438</td>
<td>(27,910,144)</td>
<td>2,062,668,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programwide costs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program management</td>
<td>234,293,854</td>
<td>168,640,887</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>168,640,887</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>168,640,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal consulting fees</td>
<td>63,107,609</td>
<td>33,186,489</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>33,186,489</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>33,186,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance and audit fees</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6,011,969</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6,011,969</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6,011,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond measure election costs</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>966,188</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>966,188</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>966,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents and leases</td>
<td>37,021,042</td>
<td>22,547,558</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>22,547,558</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>22,547,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total programwide costs</td>
<td>334,422,605</td>
<td>231,353,091</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>231,353,091</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>231,353,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total college direct costs and programwide costs</strong></td>
<td>3,523,744,463</td>
<td>$2,321,959,996</td>
<td>(28,467)</td>
<td>$2,321,931,529</td>
<td>(27,910,144)</td>
<td>$2,294,021,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unallocated interest earned</strong></td>
<td>34,546,596</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3,558,291,059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See accompanying notes to unaudited supplementary schedule of expenditures of bond proceeds.
Notes to Unaudited Supplementary Schedule of Expenditures of Bond Proceeds
Period from November 4, 2008 (inception) through June 30, 2016
(Unaudited)

(1) Background
The unaudited supplementary schedule of expenditures of bond proceeds presents expenditures for the period from November 4, 2008 (inception) through June 30, 2016.

(2) Basis of Presentation
The accompanying unaudited schedule of expenditures of bond proceeds has been prepared on the accrual basis of accounting. The Proposition 39, Smaller Classes, Safer Schools and Financial Accountability Act, of the State of California (the Act) requires an annual, independent financial audit of the expenditures of proceeds from the sale of the school facilities bonds until all of the proceeds have been expended. Accordingly, the accompanying unaudited statement of expenditures of bond proceeds includes all amounts expended using bond proceeds regardless of expenditure type, since inception.

The unaudited supplementary schedule of expenditures of bond proceeds includes the following:

(a) Budget
The amounts included within the budget column in the accompanying unaudited supplementary schedule of expenditures of bond proceeds represent reasonable estimates of the costs that will be expended to complete the various projects at each of the Los Angeles Community College District’s (the District) colleges.

(b) Cumulative Expenditures
The amounts included within the cumulative expenditures of bond proceeds in the accompanying unaudited supplementary schedule of expenditures of bond proceeds may include reclassifications and reimbursements from other funding sources for the period from November 4, 2008 (inception) through June 30, 2016.

(c) Interest Earned
Interest earned on bond issuances that has not been expended is added to project budgets upon approval by the District. Interest earned that has not yet been approved for specific projects is included in unallocated interest earned.

(d) Cumulative Reimbursements from the State of California and Other Non-Bond Sources
During the period from November 4, 2008 (inception) through June 30, 2016, the District received amounts from the State of California as reimbursement for various multifunded projects. These projects were to be funded by both state funds and bond proceeds. Prior to filing claims and receipt of funds from the state, eligible Measure J bond proceeds were used to fund the projects. The reimbursements received by the District, totaling $27,910,144 for the period from November 4, 2008 (inception) through June 30, 2016, have been reflected in the accompanying unaudited supplementary schedule of expenditures of bond proceeds as a reduction of expenditures made with bond proceeds by cost classification on a cumulative basis.
Reclassifications

Certain adjustments and reclassifications were made between the District’s various Proposition 39 bond programs during the year ended June 30, 2016, which were related to prior years. Such amounts totaling $28,467 were reclassified from Measure J funds to Proposition AA.

Reconciliation of Bond Proceeds

The following is a summary of total authorized and issued bond funds available at June 30, 2016:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonds authorized and issued</td>
<td>$ 2,225,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds authorized but not yet issued</td>
<td>1,275,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total bonds authorized</td>
<td>3,500,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other bond related source of funds:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest earned for the period from November 4, 2008 (inception) through 2016</td>
<td>40,187,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18,103,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total other bond-related sources of funds</td>
<td>3,558,291,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less expenditures of bond proceeds for the period from November 4, 2008 (inception) through June 30, 2016</td>
<td>(2,294,021,385)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total authorized bond funds remaining at June 30, 2016</td>
<td>$ 1,264,269,674</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Independent Auditors’ Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting and on Compliance and Other Matters Based on an Audit of Measure J Bond Construction Program Statement of Expenditures of Bond Proceeds Performed in Accordance with Government Auditing Standards

The Honorable Board of Trustees
Los Angeles Community College District
Los Angeles, 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 Measure J Bond Construction Program statement of expenditures of bond proceeds (statement of expenditures of bond proceeds) of the Los Angeles Community College District (the District), for the year ended June 30, 2016, and have issued our report thereon dated December 7, 2016.

Internal Control over Financial Reporting

In planning and performing our audit of the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds, we considered the 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 statement of expenditures of bond proceeds, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the District’s internal control. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the 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 the District’s statement of expenditures of bond proceeds will not be prevented, or detected and corrected, on a timely basis. A significant deficiency is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control that is less severe than a material weakness, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance.

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

Compliance and Other Matters

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the statement of expenditures of bond proceeds is free from material misstatement, we performed tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations and contracts, noncompliance with which could have a direct and material effect on the determination of statement amounts. However, providing an opinion on compliance with those provisions was not an objective of our audit, and accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. The results of our tests disclosed no instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under Government Auditing Standards.
Purpose of this Report

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

(signed) KPMG LLP

December 7, 2016
AGENDA

BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING

NOVEMBER 30, 2016

B. Bond Performance Audit
KPMG Engagement Team

- Tracy Hensley – Engagement Partner
- Kristen Olko – Engagement Senior Manager, Bond Expenditures Audits
- Erika Alvord – Director, Bond Performance Audit

Scope of Audits:

- Statements of Bond Expenditures of Propositions A, AA and J Bond Funds for the year ended June 30, 2016
- Performance Audit of the Proposition 39 Bond Program for the year ended June 30, 2016

Areas of Audit Emphasis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements of Bond Expenditures</th>
<th>Bond Performance Audit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Proper accounting and disclosure of expenditures of bond proceeds, in accordance with US Generally Accepted Accounting Principles</td>
<td>• Program Process Controls and evaluation of the Bond Program’s Standard Operating Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expenditures Included on approved project lists</td>
<td>• Bond expenditures including contract compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expended in accordance with LACCD cost principles and Proposition 39</td>
<td>• Procurement including compliance with Standard Operating Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Properly included in financial statements of District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Required Communications:

- Our Responsibilities Under Generally Accepted Auditing Standards
- Accounting Practices, Alternative Treatments and non GAAP policies
- Management’s Judgments and Estimates
- No Disagreements with Management or Difficulties Encountered During the Audits
- No Knowledge of Management’s Consultation with Other Accountants
- No Significant Issues Discussed, or Subject to Correspondence, with Management, except for
  - Engagement Letter
  - Management Representation Letter
- Independence
- Uncorrected and Corrected Misstatements
Results of Audits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements of Bond Expenditures</th>
<th>Bond Performance Audit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Statements:</strong></td>
<td><strong>No significant deficiencies noted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unmodified Opinions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Control over Financial Reporting:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Observations:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No material weaknesses or Significant deficiencies reported</td>
<td>• Standard Operating Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Procurement</td>
<td>• Expenditures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures for 2016 as follows:
- Proposition A: $7.3 million
- Proposition AA: $6.5 million
- Measure J: $272.5 million
Performance Audit of
Los Angeles Community College District
Proposition A, Proposition AA, and
Measure J Bond Programs

Fiscal Year ended June 30, 2016

December 7, 2016

KPMG LLP
550 South Hope Street
Suite 1500
Los Angeles, CA 90071
(213) 972 4000
December 7, 2016

Mr. James O'Reilly  
Chief Facilities Executive  
Los Angeles Community College District  
770 Wilshire Boulevard, 6th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Dear Mr. O'Reilly:

This report presents the results of our Performance Audit of the Los Angeles Community College District’s (LACCD) Proposition A, Proposition AA and Measure J bond programs for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016, based on our agreed upon work plan with LACCD. Our work was performed during the period of July 1, 2016 through the date of this report.

We conducted this Performance Audit in accordance with Government Auditing Standards (GAS) 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 observations based on the established audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our observations based on our audit objectives.

This Performance Audit did not constitute an audit of financial statements in accordance with Government Auditing Standards or U.S. Generally Accepted Auditing Standards. KPMG was not engaged to, and did not render an opinion on LACCD’s internal controls over financial reporting or over financial management systems.

The report includes an executive summary, background, audit scope and methodology, audit results and recommendations, and list of acronyms, as well as appendices.

Based upon the audit procedures performed and the results obtained, we have met our audit objectives. This report provided to LACCD is for the sole use of LACCD, and is not intended to be, and may not be, relied upon by any third party.

We thank you and the members of your staff who have worked diligently with our team in providing information throughout this Performance Audit. We look forward to serving LACCD in the coming years.

Sincerely,
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Performance Audit was conducted in accordance with Government Auditing Standards (GAS) issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and as a requirement for construction bond programs under California Proposition 39, Smaller Classes, Safer Schools and Financial Accountability Act (Proposition 39). Our work for the year ended June 30, 2016, was performed during the period of May 20, 2016 through the date of this report.

Objective

A Performance Audit is an objective analysis for management and those charged with governance and oversight to use to improve program performance and operations, reduce costs, facilitate decision making by parties with responsibility to oversee or initiate corrective action, and to contribute to public accountability. Further, Performance Audits seek to assess the effectiveness, economy and efficiency of the bond program.

The objective of this Performance Audit was to understand certain aspects of the Los Angeles Community College District’s (LACCD or District) management of the bond program and bond program expenditures in accordance with the requirements of Proposition 39. Total approximate aggregate bond expenditures were $154 million during the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016.

As of June 30, 2016, the District reported in their Dashboard Report current Program funding of approximately $6.27 billion, costs incurred of approximately $4.85 billion, and estimated additional costs (i.e. costs to be incurred) of approximately $1.28 billion, resulting in remaining bond funds of approximately $136 million.

Scope

The scope for this year’s Performance Audit included three areas of focus:

- **Program Processes:** The scope of our audit included conducting an independent audit of the Bond Program’s Program select controls in 39 key process areas by comparing the Program’s Standard Operating Procedures to leading industry practices, as well as performing a walk-through of select controls. The objective of this audit was to provide an independent assessment of the Bond Program’s processes and controls and establish a baseline for identifying both areas of strengths as well as process weaknesses and areas for improvement.

- **Procurement:** The scope of our audit work included evaluating key steps of the procurement process including, but not limited to, forming the solicitation; advertising and outreach; vendor evaluation, selection and notification; vendor negotiation; and contracting. The objective of our procurement audit work was to evaluate adherence to the District’s Standard Operating Procedures and recognized industry practices.

- **Bond Expenditures:** The scope of our audit included testing bond expenditures incurred in the current fiscal year and comparing these for compliance with criteria such as the District’s Cost Principles, contract requirements and requirements of Proposition 39. The objective of testing bond expenditures was to evaluate whether the costs incurred for which bond funds were used have been spent on projects and costs approved by the voters, for allowable purposes and are accounted for properly.
Our performance audit does not opine on the internal controls structure of Build LACCD or LACCD. In addition, our performance audit did not include testing of internal controls to determine if the internal controls are operating as designed. Our approach to evaluating the District’s Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) is limited to the processes included with KPMG’s methodology and approach as described herein.

Summary of Observations

During this year’s audit, we noted that management implemented changes to some of the bond program’s key capital project delivery processes. In particular, changes were noted in the bond program process areas of procurement, change order, forecasting and cost reporting, pay applications, schedule reporting and project closeout. Although changes were noted, we did identify areas where additional improvements can be made.

The order of priority is a subjective ranking of importance among the observations as follows:

**High** - The recommendation pertains to a serious or materially significant audit finding or control weakness. Due to the seriousness or significance of the matter, immediate management attention and appropriate corrective action is warranted.

**Medium** - The recommendation pertains to a moderately significant or potentially serious audit finding or control weakness. Reasonably prompt corrective action should be taken by management to address the matter. Recommendation should be implemented no later than six months.

**Low** - The recommendation pertains to an audit finding or control weakness of relatively minor significance or concern. The timing of any corrective action is left to management's discretion.

**Process Related Observations** (Low)

1. Overall, LACCD’s Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) are comprised of many leading industry practices as promulgated by leading construction industry organizations. However, four processes areas were identified as having room for improvement. They include: (a) Project Management Reporting, (b) Value Engineering, (c) Procurement Planning, and (d) Site Security.

**Procurement Observations** (Low/Medium)

In general, the procurement process has improved over the past years. Further improvements that could enhance the process include the following:

2a. The LACCD bond program Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for Contracts and Procurement Management currently do not reference two procurement/contracting methods used by the Program: (a) Construction Orders and (b) pre-qualified Multiple Award Task Order Contracts (MATOC).

2b. Supporting documentation for procurement is at times incomplete.

2c. Procurement documents do not incorporate a consistent naming convention and at times are not readily available electronically.
Project Expenditure Observation (Low)

3. Certain invoiced amounts do not comply with the contractual terms and conditions and certain supporting documentation is incomplete by immaterial amounts

Summary

Based on our audit, we did not identify any significant internal control deficiencies. We did not identify any significant\(^1\) charges to the Program that did not conform to the requirements of Proposition A, Proposition AA, and Measure J. We conclude that the District’s Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) comprise many leading practices utilized in the industry. However, based on our audit scope this year, we made five observations where we identified opportunities for improvements.

\(^{1}\) GAS 7.04: “Significance is defined as the relative importance of a matter within the context in which it is being considered, including quantitative and qualitative factors.” In the Performance Audit standards, the term “significant” is comparable to the term “material” as used in the context of financial statement audits.
BACKGROUND

In November 2000, the California legislature passed Proposition 39, Smaller Classes, Safer Schools and Financial Accountability Act of the State of California, which amended provisions to the California Constitution (Article XIII) and the California Education Code (Section 15272) to include accountability measures for bond programs. Specifically, the District must conduct an annual, independent Performance Audit of its construction bond program to ensure that funds have been expended only on the specific projects listed.

The District bond program is funded by Proposition A, Proposition AA, and Measure J, which were approved by voters in 2001, 2003, and 2008, respectively. The total authorized bond fund dollars are $6.2 billion and are designated for capital improvements for the renovation and replacement of aging facilities, and for the construction of new facilities.

BuildLACCD

BuildLACCD’s function is to facilitate the delivery of projects under the bond program. It consists of over 200 positions in a number of functional areas and includes several consultants and members of District staff. The largest function of BuildLACCD is the program management function provided by AECOM Technical Services, Inc. (AECOM or PM) as of April 4, 2013.

The Los Angeles Community College District’s (LACCD or District) bond program has operated under a decentralized model since 2007 with significant level of autonomy resting with the individual colleges, including project management decisions, documentation requirements, and methodologies. Under the AECOM program management agreement, all College Project Teams (CPTs) are contracted directly with the District but report to AECOM. This creates a centralized structure and establishes accountability by all of BuildLACCD.

College Project Teams (CPT)

The CPTs for each college reports directly to AECOM and are responsible for performing services to oversee college master planning, environmental impact studies, programming, design, construction, close-out, and occupancy. The CPTs are also responsible for overseeing design consultants, contractors, and vendors. Prior to 2015, the CPTs were known as College Project Managers (CPMs).

District Expenditures

As of June 30, 2016, the District reported in their Dashboard Report current Program funding of approximately $6.27 billion, costs incurred of approximately $4.85 billion, and estimated additional costs (i.e. costs to be incurred) of approximately $1.28 billion, resulting in remaining bond funds of approximately $136 million.
AUDIT SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

This Performance Audit encompasses the District construction bond program and does not include the District’s business operations, administration, or management of any projects outside of the bond program. In addition, KPMG’s work under this engagement did not include providing technical opinions related to engineering, design, and facility operations and maintenance.

This Performance Audit was conducted in accordance with Government Auditing Standards (GAS) issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and as a requirement for construction bond programs under California Proposition 39, Smaller Classes, Safer Schools and Financial Accountability Act (Proposition 39). Our work for the year ended June 30, 2016, was performed during the period of May 20, 2016 through the date of this report.

Methodology

Government Auditing Standards (GAS), as promulgated by the Government Accountability Office (GAO), require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our comments and conclusions based on the audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our comments and conclusions based on the audit objectives. As such, we followed the requirements of GAS and the District with respect to our methodology, which included the following elements:

- Conducting a risk assessment to identify areas of risk.
- Designing an audit plan based on issues and risks identified in the risk assessment phase.
- Conducting fieldwork with detail testing to further assess the risks and carry out our audit plan.
- Preparing an audit report for the District based on the results of our Performance Audit.

We reviewed the District’s internal policies, procedures, and documentation of key processes. We conducted interviews with BuildLACCD personnel and other contractors and consultants involved with BuildLACCD and the District bond program. We reviewed relevant source documentation to gain an understanding of the key functions of the District as they relate to the scope of this audit and corroborated key interview statements with test work.

Scope

The scope for this year’s Performance Audit included three areas of focus:

Program Processes

Our objective of evaluating the District’s key program processes relative was to:

a) compare the District’s Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) to leading practices, as promulgated by leading construction industry organizations as well as leading practices identified by KPMG;

b) provide an independent assessment of the bond program’s key processes and controls and establish a baseline for identifying both areas of process strengths and weaknesses, as well as areas for improvement;

c) evaluate actual process steps conducted by District and BuildLACCD employees and document instances of deviation from the SOPs.
Our approach to evaluate the District; key program processes, included KPMG’s proprietary construction Controls Assessment Tool. This tools was developed to evaluate the overall strength of a capital program’s key processes and controls included with the SOPs in five major process control categories and 39 process control subcategories and calculated a rating to each category and subcategory. Each process control included 3 to 8 specific assessment areas, 166 in total, that are rated based on leading practice criteria.

The five key program areas evaluated included:

- Strategy, organization, and administration;
- Cost and financial management;
- Procurement management;
- Project controls and risk management; and
- Schedule management.

The table below summarizes the ranking of the control ratings, although specific definitions for each score were utilized for each assessment area, based on leading practices:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Rating Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≥3.5</td>
<td>Tier 4</td>
<td>Optimized</td>
<td>Integrated controls have been designed and are adequately documented, with real–time monitoring being completed and continuous improvement efforts underway to refine the control framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 to 3.49</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>Monitored</td>
<td>Controls have been designed and are adequately documented for standardized use across the company. Some periodic testing is completed to report to management on the effective design and operation of the controls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 to 2.49</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>Standardized</td>
<td>Many controls have been designed and are adequately documented; but there are no established monitoring activities from which to test and improve the control framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 1.49</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>Unreliable/Informal</td>
<td>Unpredictable environment where many controls are not designed or in place, in which no documentation exists, and therefore, no monitoring or improvement activities are occurring. Some controls may have been designed but are not adequately documented, monitored, or refined.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We then compared LACCD’s ratings to other higher-education institutions and leading organizations outside of the higher education industry. These entities also deliver large, complex construction programs and have utilized KPMG’s Controls Assessment Tool.

KPMG conducted meetings with subject matter experts from the Program Management Office (PMO) and College Project Teams (CPTs) to walk-through activities performed and documentation prepared for specific process areas, in order to compare the PMO’s and CPT’s actual practice against the documented SOPs. The specific process areas reviewed during the walk-throughs included: contractor payment processing; change order and field order management; cost forecasting and reporting; project closeout; and schedule reporting.
Procurement

Our objective of auditing the procurement process for the program as a whole for contracts awarded and/or negotiated in the current audit period is to understand compliance with key procurement process steps and requirements.

We selected a sample of contracts awarded during the FY2015/16 audit period based on the population as a whole. We evaluated the key steps of the procurement process including, but not limited to, forming the solicitation; advertising and outreach; vendor evaluation, selection and notification; vendor negotiation; and contracting. We performed the following activities:

- Interviewed key program personnel with a specific knowledge related to the procurement and contract process.
- Evaluated the LACCD bond program SOPs, Program Management Administration - Contract Management, revised May 24, 2016.
- Evaluated any revisions to the SOPs on Contract Management.
- Documented the process for evaluating review of procurement process by Build-LACCD.
- Evaluated (on a sample basis) procurement controls for competitive bidding. Specific areas targeted included:
  - Procurement planning
  - Solicitation planning and solicitation
  - Compliance with California Public Contract Code and LACCD requirements, outreach efforts
  - Source selection
  - Contract negotiation and execution
  - Prequalification
  - Bid and proposal evaluation
  - Contract administration
  - Conflicts of Interest (COI)
- Assessed the experience level of the key employees involved with the procurement and contracting efforts.
- Evaluated procurement/contract process against industry leading practices.
- Documented improvements to the procurement process (based on KPMG’s last assessment of procurement process in FY11/12).

Bond Expenditure Testing

Our objective of testing bond expenditures was to establish whether costs incurred, for which bond funds were used, were spent on projects and costs approved by the voters for allowable purposes and are accounted for properly. Specifically, we performed the following procedures:

We selected a sample of FY2015/16 bond expenditures and reviewed supporting documentation to validate the performance of bond program funds expended and measure against bond program criteria. Such criteria included the requirements of Proposition 39, LACCD Cost Principles, and other Performance Audit criteria, such as those set forth in and by Proposition 39, Cost Principles, the Project Management Manual, BuildLACCD SOPs, California Public Contract Code, contract language, and published industry practices. We performed the following activities:

- Performed a walkthrough of the bond funds expenditure cycle and documented instances of internal control weaknesses or non-compliance with audit criteria.
- Reconciled bond funds with project expenditures.
- Assessed whether costs incurred were compliant with bond program criteria stated above.
- Evaluated expenditure reporting to the Board of Trustees (BOT) and District Citizens’ Oversight...
Committee (DCOC), which include Dashboard and audit reports.

- Documented instances where processes can be improved.

We evaluated compliance with the contract funding source and with Proposition 39. We performed the following procedures related to bond expenditure compliance:

- Compared Campus capital expenditures with LACCD expenditures accounting and funding source, if a separate system or file exists, to identify discrepancies, if any.
- Compared project budget and scope to current authorized budget and scope, and allowable purposes under Proposition 39.
- Evaluated expenditure controls.
- On a sample basis, tested contractor invoiced costs for compliance with contractual terms (a full contract compliance audit was not part of this audit scope).
AUDIT RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Program Processes

A bond program of the size and complexity like LACCD’s, requires an adequate Program internal control structure in place. A Program’s policies and procedures help create an internal control framework for an organization. It is this internal control framework that management will rely upon and that will help ensure the organization’s objectives are being met. Well-written policies and procedures also allow employees to clearly understand their roles and responsibilities within predefined limits. LACCD’s policies and procedures for the bond program are include with the Program’s SOPs.

Over the past four years, our Performance Audit results indicated that the bond program SOPs and key processes and controls were incomplete. In certain process areas, prior years’ observations identified several instances of inadequate oversight and incomplete monitoring activities by BuildLACCD. Additionally, past audit results identified a number of contract compliance issues, and insufficient Project documentation practices. These observations were attributed in part to the lack of documented leading practices incorporated with the bond program’s SOPs.

This year, we noted that management implemented changes to the bond program’s SOPs. BuildLACCD continues to improve bond program processes, incorporate leading practices and document requirements in the SOPs. Examples of changes noted are as follows:

- **Procurement** – Implementation of the web-based PlanetBids procurement system to allow for secure remote access and the ability for vendors to submit documents online.
- **Change order** – Improved organization of requirements for change order packages and definition of submittal requirements. Demonstrated understanding of required elements (i.e., forms, information, signatures) to confirm completeness of the change order package.
- **Forecasting and cost reporting** – Improved monthly cost and project status oversight and reporting process. Monthly Cost Reports included location/links to supporting documentation that justify reported costs. Project Controls Status Reports track various cost metrics using a stoplight chart to show overall status.
- **Pay applications** – Application of automated invoice routing through PMIS and staff training.
- **Schedule reporting** – Application of a third-party schedule analysis software to assess the quality of contractors’ baseline and monthly schedule updates, and preparation of monthly reports based on the schedule analysis.
- **Project closeout** – Improved documentation and understanding of the closeout process, including on-going communication and forms prepared at various milestones. Demonstration that the closeout process is actively being tracked and that closeout activities are occurring throughout the project lifecycle.
- **Conflicts of Interest (COI)** – LACCD has implemented policies and procedures to address conflicts of interest in the procurement process in order to identify personal relationships or other relationships that would constitute a conflict. The new COI policies and procedures cover both for members of selection committees as well as members of the contractor community.

Our audit results, which are based on KPMG’s controls assessment tool as described in our methodology, identified four areas where the District can continue to improve:

1. **Overall, LACCD’s Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) are comprised of many leading industry practices as promulgated by leading construction industry organizations. However, four processes areas were identified as having room for improvement. (Low)**
Criteria: Leading construction industry organizations have identified leading industry practices related to capital construction Programs, which include processes or methods that, when executed effectively, lead to enhanced project performance. Such leading practices have been proven through extensive industry use and/or validation.

Leading practices in policies and procedures promulgated by leading industry organizations were reviewed and considered during this analysis. The District’s SOP’s were compared against such leading practices as well as leading practices identifies by KPMG, other organizations, and governmental agencies incorporated into KPMG’s Controls Assessment Tool. Included, but not limited to those leading practices are:

- Project Management Institute of America (PMI)
- Construction Management Association of America Construction Management Standards of Practice
- Construction Industry Institute (CII) Best Practices
- American Institute of Architects, The Architect’s Handbook of Professional Practice
- Elements of policies and procedures for a variety of agencies previously reviewed by KPMG.

The prevailing industry standards on policies and procedures prescribe the following key elements of an effective procedure:

- The procedures identifies who is responsible, accountable, consulted, and/or informed.
- The procedure includes clear objectives and detailed instructions on how to perform the task.
- The procedure states when the tasks needs to take place.
- The procedure includes references to relevant forms and documents.
- The procedure includes graphic diagrams and or business process flow charts.
- The procedure prescribes records retention and document update requirements.
- The procedure is maintained, updated, and issued by a centralized function.
- Procedure update notifications are generated and distributed automatically through a Project Management Information System (PMiS) or other leading document repository system.
- End users are involved in developing procedures.
- Superfluous terms such as “may, should, as applicable, and as necessary” are avoided and replaced with clearly defined requirements.

Condition: Based on KPMG’s evaluation and scoring of the the District’s bond program processes utilizing KPMG’s proprietary Controls Assessment Tool, the District achieved an overall average process control rating of “Monitored” or a score between 3.04 and 3.51 on a scale where a score above 3.5 is considered optimized and a score above a 2.5 means that controls are adequately documented for standardized use across the organization. Overall, the bond program’s key processes and controls have been designed and are adequately documented for standardized use across the bond program with some periodic testing being completed and reported to management on the effective design and operation of the controls.

Table 1 below summarizes the District’s bond program’s average overall rating and the average rating for each of the five key program areas, as compared to other higher-education institutions and leading companies outside of the higher-education industry from KPMG’s controls assessment tool and global database. Refer to Table 2 for a summary table of the District’s bond program’s rating for each of the 39 sub-category process areas.

Most of these entities included with KPMG’s gloabal database did not conduct continuous evalauations of their policies and proceduers to the extent that LACCD has done over the years prior to their Controls Assessment. As a result of ongoing efforts and improvements to their SOPs, LACCD was able to attain a
higher than average overall score when compared to their industry peers, most whom conducted the Control Assessment knowing or suspecting that their processes needed improvement.

### 1. Project Management Reporting (Core control)

- The *SOPs* do not include standardized report templates or format for weekly/monthly progress reporting, internal or external or for routine compliance testing to confirm that weekly/monthly progress reporting is consistently prepared and follows a standardized format. Although the monthly *Dashboard Report* is named, it is not incorporated as a template.
- Although required reports related to progress, cost, and schedule are mentioned throughout the *SOPs* there is not a comprehensive reporting matrix included with the *SOPs* to clearly identify all reports by type, timing, responsible entity, and distribution. The PMT provided a matrix, but it is not referenced by the *SOPs*.
- *Dashboard Reports* do not include overall or project metrics on schedule, such as original completion date, forecasted completion date, schedule variance, and percentage completion. Additional metrics that may be important for management to analyze trend and historical data are not tracked and reported. These additional metrics may include the recordable incident rate, the Lost daily case rate, number and amount of contractor claims, number and amount of project rework, Architect/Engineering (AE) fee percentage, Construction Manager/General Contractor (CM/GC) fee percentage and amount, price per square foot, change order percentage, and earned value management statistics. Dashboard reporting requirements should be defined in a template in the *SOPs*.

---

### Table 1 - Process Control Ratings by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optimized (3.5&lt;)</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitored (2.5 to 3.49)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized (1.5 to 2.49)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreliable/Informal (1 to 1.49)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: KPMG’s Controls Assessment Tool and Global Database including 3 higher-education institutions and 40 other companies from healthcare, pharmaceuticals, power and utilities, oil and gas, manufacturing/industrial, engineering/construction, and technology industries.
2. Value Engineering (Support control)
   • Although value engineering activities may be performed on projects, there is not a formal, documented value engineering process with tracking, reporting, and monitoring of value engineering activities.

3. Procurement Planning (Support control)
   • There is not a documented requirement in the SOPs to develop, review, approve, and monitor a formal project procurement plan for all projects above an established dollar threshold that is standardized across the bond program. A procurement planning process ensures that all contract activities and contract milestones are identified, and that the procurement plan is regularly updated and communicated. Procurement plans should include/address the following:
     – Identify which services are needed and which will be provided internally along with supporting justifications, key risks, assumptions/constraints, and market analysis.
     – Identify all owner procured equipment and responsible party.
     – Identify contract type/form for each major service and whether the contract will be competitively bid. This will include identifying which business unit/department is responsible for developing the scope statement.
     – Major milestones for each contract.
     – Owner's and actions for each procurement activity.

Although not audited by KPMG, the PMT reported that they conduct a number of Procurement planning activities. These activities have not been documented and incorporated with the SOPs.

4. Project Site Security (Support control)
   • There are no formal site security policies and procedures in the SOPs that identify requirements for physical site access, video cameras, background checks, etc. Although contractor responsibilities are incorporated into their respective contracts, the SOPs do not reference them and the language is general in nature and language does not include all leading practices.

   • Leading practices may include formalized site security policies and procedures utilized on all major construction projects with real time tracking of project personnel (professional services, construction, as well as Build and District personnel) via electronic badging system and project video cameras setup throughout project sites. District Project personnel may be vetted via formal background checks and project personnel may be required to pass drug screening, as required. Site security should perform frequent and routine project site security checks that are documented and all incidences are formally documented, tracked and investigated.

Additionally, we understand that requirement of background checks is currently being considered by the District.

Cause: The SOPs are continually refined and improved by BuildLACCD and have not optimized and documented all required core and support processes related to value engineering, project management reporting, procurement planning, and project site security, and the standardized documentation required to be prepared as part of the process.

Effect: Project Management Reporting: Without standardized reporting templates for external and internal KPI reporting and instructions how to prepare it incorporated with the SOPs, individuals tasked with reporting may report key performance data differently, and the District and management may not receive sufficient insight into overall project and program performance as it relates to schedule, change

---

3 The purpose of value engineering is to improve the value of projects by identifying opportunities to reduce cost while maintaining or improving the essential functions, performance, quality, and safety of the project.
orders, contractor fees, claim, and other metrics, for example.

**Value Engineering:** LACCD may not be maximizing opportunities to increase project value due to the lack of a documented and formalized value engineering process that is incorporated throughout the project lifecycle.

- The term Value Engineering (VE) is mentioned in several areas throughout the *SOPs*, however, the term Value Engineering is not defined in the *SOPs* nor are the required action steps explained at each point in the process where the term is mentioned.

- Leading value engineering practices include a formalized value engineering process that is incorporated throughout the project lifecycle for all major construction projects with tracking and reporting of value engineering activities via a database that provides real time updates and includes prioritization, activity scheduling/tracking, ownership identification and cost estimation.

**Procurement Planning:** Informal procurement planning by the PMO and CPT for major construction projects may result in limited or incomplete identification, evaluation, and communication of major contracts, contract activities, milestones, and ownership of major procurement activities.

**Project Site Security:** With informal or limited site security policies and procedures utilized on major construction projects, there may be little or no formal tracking and monitoring of site access, which may not be sufficiently monitored. As a result, LACCD’s bond program facilities and project information may be accessed by unauthorized individuals.

---

**Recommendation 1a: Project Management Reporting (Core control):** Build should consider incorporating standardized reporting template(s) with their *SOPs*. In addition, Build should incorporate their reporting matrix into the SOPs listing all required, reoccurring reports prepared by the PMO, CPT, and contractors, by type, timing, and distribution.

**Recommendation 1b: Value Engineering (Support control):** Build should consider documenting in their *SOPs* a formalized value engineering process for relevant projects an established dollar threshold, with tracking and reporting of value engineering activities that provides updates and includes prioritization, activity scheduling/tracking, ownership identification and cost estimation.

**Recommendation 1c: Procurement Planning (Support control):** Build should consider incorporating with their *SOPs* a formalized procurement planning process on all construction projects that includes planning for all major contracts and supplier agreements that is updated and reported on a frequent basis and includes identification of contracts, contract activities, key risks, milestones and ownership of procurement activities.

**Recommendation 1d: Project Site Security (Support control):** Build and the District should consider documenting formalized site security policies and procedures for monitoring and vetting of project personnel and site access within their *SOPs* and District policies, as applicable.
Table 2 – PROGRAM PROCESS RATING BY SUB-CATEGORY PROCESS AREA
The table below summarizes the District’s bond program’s rating for each of the 39 sub-category process areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Score: 3.33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score: 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy, Organization, &amp; Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: 3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost &amp; Financial Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: 3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: 3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Controls &amp; Risk Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score: 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

**Core Process Control**

**Support Process Control**

**Score** | **Tier** | **Rating** | **Rating Description**
---|---|---|---
≥3.5 | Tier 4 | Optimized | Integrated controls have been designed and are adequately documented, with real-time monitoring being completed and continuous improvement efforts underway to refine the control framework.
2.5 to 3.49 | Tier 3 | Monitored | Controls have been designed and are adequately documented for standardized use across the company. Some periodic testing is completed to report to management on the effective design and operation of the controls.
1.5 to 2.49 | Tier 2 | Standardized | Many controls have been designed and are adequately documented, but there are no established monitoring activities from which to test and improve the control framework.
1 to 1.49 | Tier 1 | Unreliable/Informal | Unpredictable environment where many controls are not designed or in place, in which no documentation exists, and therefore, no monitoring or improvement activities are occurring. Some controls may have been designed but are not adequately documented, monitored, or refined.
**Procurement**

The FY2015/16 Performance Audit results indicated that the District has formal, standard operating procedures over the procurement process. Our prior audit of procurement in FY2011/12 identified limitations in the District’s retention of procurement documentation. As a result, we were not able to conclude that the District’s procurement process was effective, efficient, or in line with leading practices.

This year, we noted changes were implemented to the District’s procurement practices, including the District’s application of PlanetBids for procurement. PlanetBids is a web-based eProcurement solution that also used by several other public entities in California. This practice appears to have contributed to a more efficient and effective procurement process.

Additionally, BuildLACCD made changes to its procurement policies and procedures, *Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs)*. We identified the following additional areas that could further enhance the process:

2a. **The LACCD bond program Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for Contracts and Procurement Management currently do not reference two procurement/contracting methods used by the Program: (a) Construction Orders and (b) pre-qualified Multiple Award Task Order Contracts (MATOC), (Low/Medium)**

**Criteria:** The bond program SOP’s dated May 24, 2016, specifically, the Professional Services Contract Management Procedure: Multiple Award Task Order Contracts and the Design Bid Build Contract Management Procedure: Projects of $45,000 or less, establishes and defines the procurement requirements.

**Condition:** In our discussions with the PMO about the procurement process, it was explained that part of the procedure for a Multiple Award Task Order Contract (MATOC) procurement of pre-qualified construction service providers. This type of MATOC procurement is currently not incorporated with the SOPs.

The Parking Lot Improvements at Pierce Center for the Sciences project at LAPC was procured through a construction order, which is currently used as a contract option for construction less than $30,000; however, this contracting method is not defined in the SOPs and the template used is not incorporated with the SOPs. This limit was originally set by the District.

**Cause:** The Procurement SOPs, just like the overall SOPs, are continually refined by Build and have not yet documented all permitted procurement methods. The SOPs do not include defined prequalified service provider tier assignments based on contract values for MATOC procurements nor do they include a reference to the use of construction orders for procurement.

**Effect:** Contract values serve as a driver for MATOC procurement. Lack of specified contract value limits may lead to inconsistencies in awarding contracts, and lack of transparency and adherence to the SOPs during the procurement process. In addition, a lack of documented procurement SOPs related to the use of construction orders may lead to inconsistencies during the procurement process.

**Recommendation 2a:** BuildLACCD should update MATOC procurement procedures to include the process for pre-qualified constructions service providers. BuildLACCD should also update the SOPs to include the process and requirement for the use of construction orders; the construction order contracting document should be updated to reflect the $45,000 limit and included with the SOPs.
2b. **Supporting documentation for procurement is at times incomplete.** (Low)

**Criteria:** LACCD bond program SOP, Contracts and Procurement Management, effective May 24, 2016 establishes and defines procurement requirements.

*Design Bid Build Contract Management Procedure: Projects of $45,000 or less.*

*Professional Services Contract Management Procedure: Individual Procurement Exceeding $87,800*

*Design Build Contract Management Procedure*

*Design Bid Build Contract Management Procedure: Projects over $175,000*

- Article 6.1.a states that, “PMO Program Controls confirms the available budget for the scope of work before PMO Contracts proceeds with procurement activities.”
- Article 8.2 states that, “The Construction Contracts Liaison (CCL) obtains confirmation from PMO Program controls that sufficient funds are available.”
- Article 7.2.1.b states that, “Budget Transfer or Project Budget Verification Form, signed, with transmittal copied to College President (or other verification of College President’s knowledge).”
- Article 7.2.2 states that, “The Notice to Bidders process also involves CPT/Construction Contracts Liaison (CCL) confirmation that estimates are aligned with the PMO Program Controls Budget.”
- Article 7.5.9 states that, “The Contract Administrator, CPT and Regional Program Liaison (RPL) will ascertain that the contractor has complied with all pre-award and post award requirements.”

**Condition:** Procurement documents do not consistently include evidence of required confirmations, approvals and validations. During our testing for existence and compliance of required procurement supporting documentation we noted 9 of 97 tests that failed or could not be performed due to missing or incomplete documentation. The test results relate to seven specific contracts out of ten contracts sampled in total:

- A project budget verification form or other verification or other sufficient form of verification of College President’s knowledge, as required by the SOPs, was not included with the procurement documentation for the following solicitation:
  - Design-bid-build (DBB) Parking Lot Improvements at Pierce Center for the Sciences project at Los Angeles Pierce College (LAPC).

- Confirmation of available budget for procurement was not included with the procurement documentation for the following solicitations:
  - OCIP Brokerage and Administrative Services throughout the District.
  - Multi-discipline Architectural-Engineering Design Services, the School of Math and Science at the Los Angeles Southwest Community College (LASWC).

- Project budget verification forms were not validated (signed) by the Program Manager or Program Controls for the following solicitations:
  - Pierce Automotive CIP Architect of Record (LAPC).
  - Valley Central Plant project at Los Angeles Valley College (LAVC).

- CPT/CCL confirmation that estimates align with PMO for DBB task orders were not available for the following projects:
  - Performing Arts Amphitheater at West Los Angeles College (WLAC).
  - Central Plant Phase 2 (WLAC).

- Contract Administrator, CPT and RPL confirmation of contractor compliance with all pre- and post-award requirements for DBB task orders for the following projects:
  - Performing Arts Amphitheater (WLAC).
  - Central Plant Phase 2 at (WLAC).
**Cause:** The SOPs are not explicit in terms of how certain actions steps involving confirmation, verification or compliance of various process requirements are to be documented and how that documentation should be retained.

In the case of the missing confirmations for available budget and estimate alignment, there were no specific forms or documents available to show record that this verification occurred. While the project budget verification forms were not signed as validated by the Program Manager or Program Controls, they were signed as prepared by Project Controls. Additionally, while a ‘Responsiveness Check’ document and the ‘Task Order’ document was provided to satisfy the pre-award and post-award requirements, respectively, neither of these documents serve the purpose of verifying requirements are met specifically during the pre-award and post award phases.

As a result of the lack of explicit compliance documentation requirements in the SOPs, it was not clear if the SOPs were followed or enforced by Program Manager.

**Effect:** The SOPs establish required documents, confirmation and approvals necessary for procurement. When these requirements are not obtained, the procurement and award process may be incomplete and prone to errors or project complications during construction. Missing documents in a database result in no back up of the original document and delays with document retrieval. Additionally, the Program Manager may not have confirmed that there are sufficient funds available to complete the project.

**Recommendation 2b-1:** The District should document all procurement confirmations, approvals and validations specific to their purpose to ensure they are official and traceable.

**Recommendation 2b-2:** Build should incorporate the documentation requirements above with the SOPs.

---

2c. **Procurement documents do not incorporate a consistent naming convention and at times are not readily available electronically.** (Low)

**Criteria:** LACCD bond program Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for Contracts and Procurement Management, date May 24, 2016 establishes and defines the procurement requirements.

- Professional Services Contract Management Procedure: Multiple Award Task Order Contracts
- Professional Services Contract Management Procedure: Individual Procurement Exceeding $87,800
- Design Bid Build Contract Management Procedure: Projects of $45,000 or less
- Design Bid Build Contract Management Procedure: Projects over $175,000
- Design Build Contract Management Procedure
- Master Agreement Contract Management Procedure: Formal Bids, exceeding $87,800

**Condition:** Procurement documents were difficult to locate in DocView, which serves as the bond program’s primary document repository. No procedure or naming convention is incorporated in the SOPs to facilitate easy location reference and searchable terms of specific documents, whether maintained in DocView or located elsewhere.

**Cause:** Build maintains at least two document repositories, one for open Procurement files and DocView for completed solicitations. DocView also incorporates other Build documents as it serves as the Program’s main document control tool. The two separate systems follow two different naming conventions, neither which is references by the SOPs.

**Effect:** As a result of the two document filing systems and the lack of a documented and meaningful naming convention to facilitate swift location and retrieval of documents, documents required for the
audit needed to be located and retrieved by Build and subsequently uploaded to DocView or sent to the auditors to accommodate the audit requests. The lack of a formally documented naming convention and searchable terms incorporated with the SOPs also made searching for required documents in DocView more difficult for Build team members. Additionally, the lack of a naming convention also attributes to overlooking a document that actually has been uploaded to DocView and further complicates and delays document retrieval.

**Recommendation 2c:** Build should retain all relevant procurement documents based on the SOPs and track submission into DocView or other meaningful repository to ensure location, availability and completeness at any given point of the Procurement process (as well as other processes). Incorporating a formal naming convention will also help to improve document accessibility.

**Expenditures**

3. **Certain invoiced amounts do not comply with the contractual terms and conditions, and supporting documentation is incomplete by immaterial amounts. (Low)**

Prior Performance Audit results have indicated that that certain invoices related to bond expenditures did not comply with contractual terms and conditions and/or did not contain adequate supporting documentation to support the charges. Areas of non-compliance included missing required forms and signatures, incorrectly calculated invoice amounts, and expenditures that were not compliant with certain terms and conditions of the governing contract. Our audit findings have been minor in nature and have not resulted in significant overbillings to the District.

This year, we have one repeat finding. Although the finding is minor, the District would still benefit from making adjustments to certain contractual clauses or invoice practices. Specifically, we identified the following opportunities for improvement:

**Condition:**

- Seven invoices in the amount of $203,134 did not include conditional or unconditional waivers as required by the contract terms. According to the District, waivers are not required for professional services and do not apply. However, this should be reflected in the contract. (This is a repeat observation.)

- Six invoices in the amount of $104,032 did not include a narrative progress report as required by the contract terms. According to the District, the invoices are for professional services and a narrative progress report does not apply. However, this should be reflected in the contract.

**Cause:** Some of the contractual requirements do not apply and, therefore, were not enforced by the project team, while other invoicing requirements have been overlooked.

**Effect:** The District may be subject to overcharges or unwarranted liens due to lacking and/or complying with proper contract terms and conditions.

**Recommendation 3:** The District should ensure appropriate contract terms related to contractor and vendor billings are executed and subsequently followed.
## MANAGEMENT RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.</th>
<th>FY16 Audit Observation</th>
<th>KPMG Effect/Recommendation</th>
<th>BuildLACCD Management Response</th>
<th>BuildLACCD Process Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1a | Project Management Reporting (Core control) | **Effect:** Without standardized reporting templates for external and internal KPI reporting and instructions how to prepare it incorporated with the SOPs, individuals tasked with reporting may report key performance data differently, and the District and management may not receive sufficient insight into overall project and program performance as it relates to schedule, change orders, contractor fees, claim, and other metrics, for example.  

**Recommendation:** Build should consider incorporating standardized reporting template(s) with their SOPs. In addition, Build should incorporate their reporting matrix into the SOPs listing all required, reoccurring reports prepared by the PMO, CPT, and contractors, by type, timing, and distribution.  

The Program Management Team feels requirements for standardized reports, including weekly/monthly progress reports at Program and Project levels, are included throughout the SOPs, including in the PMA 1.0 Overview and PMO Internal Policy SOP; PMA 5.0 Budget and Cost Management SOP; PMA 6.0 Schedule Management SOP; PMA 7.0 Finance/Accounting Management SOP; PMA 10.0 Risk Management SOP; and CP 3.0 Safety SOP. Additionally, internal monthly project progress reporting is documented during the Program Controls guided Campus Regional Review work sessions conducted for full compliance by the Deputy Program Director and Program Controls department lead. All reporting output is recorded and verified in standardized templates, and delivered to the CFE on a monthly basis, including the standardized monthly Dashboard Report posted to the BuildLACCD.org public website.  

However, the Program Management Team will review the SOPs for needed additional guidance on requirements for specific templates that Bond Program teams need to utilize to prepare these various reports. | Kathleen Copus |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.</th>
<th>FY16 Audit Observation</th>
<th>KPMG Effect/Recommendation</th>
<th>BuildLACCD Management Response</th>
<th>BuildLACCD Process Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|    | • Although required reports related to progress, cost, and schedule are mentioned throughout the *SOPs* there is not a comprehensive reporting matrix included with the *SOPs* to clearly identify all reports by type, timing, responsible entity, and distribution. The PMT provided a matrix, but it is not referenced by the *SOPs.* | Late in 2013, and in the ongoing effort to track and monitor reporting compliance, a fully detailed PMO Reporting Deliverables Matrix was developed, clearly identifying all required PMO reports by type, timing, point of contact and distribution in compliance with the basic services agreement. In response to the needs of the District, in May 2015, the PMO provided and the LACCD Chief Facilities Executive authorized an update to this Deliverables Matrix showing a revised PMO-suggested frequency of reporting interval(s). This Deliverables Matrix has been subsequently updated and continues to be utilized to manage and direct PMO reporting efforts.  

*The Program Management Team will review the SOPs, in particular the Overview and PMO Internal Policy SOP, to incorporate language referencing this Deliverables Matrix as a reports management tool.* | Kathleen Copus |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.</th>
<th>FY16 Audit Observation</th>
<th>KPMG Effect/Recommendation</th>
<th>BuildLACCD Management Response</th>
<th>BuildLACCD Process Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Dashboard reports do not include overall or project metrics on schedule, such as original completion date, forecasted completion date, schedule variance, and percentage completion. Additional metrics that may be important for management to analyze trend and historical data are not tracked and reported. These additional metrics may include the Recordable Incident Rate, the Lost Daily Case Rate, number and amount of contractor claims, number and amount of project rework, AE Fee percentage, CM/GC Fee percentage and amount, price per square foot, change order percentage, and earned value management statistics. Dashboard reporting requirements should be defined in the SOPs.</td>
<td>The new enhanced Dashboard Report to be produced in October 2016 incorporates updated schedule data for each active sub-project in the program, including active construction physical percent complete. The monthly Campus Regional Reviews include a project health check reviewing and comparing current forecasts to the April 2016 Deep Dive Forecasts. In addition, PMO notes that some of additional KPMG noted metrics are considered confidential information and therefore are not appropriate for the published public Dashboard report. Some of these metrics are tracked and reported in separate KPI reports and/or to client separately. PMO will review and consider these recommendations for possible implementation.</td>
<td>Kathleen Copus</td>
<td>Jennifer Salinas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Value Engineering (Support control) Although value engineering activities may be performed on projects, there is not a formal, documented value engineering process with tracking, reporting, and monitoring of value engineering activities.</td>
<td>Effect: LACCD may not be maximizing opportunities to increase project value due to the lack of a documented and formalized value engineering process that is incorporated throughout the project lifecycle. • The term Value Engineering (VE) is mentioned in several areas</td>
<td>The PMO regularly implements value engineering and other cost savings practices despite the lack of a formal process. PMO will add the Value Engineering (VE) definition to the SOPs as part of adding additional VE narrative in the SOPs.</td>
<td>Nader Farnoush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>FY16 Audit Observation</td>
<td>KPMG Effect/Recommendation</td>
<td>BuildLACCD Management Response</td>
<td>BuildLACCD Process Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>throughout the SOPs, however, the term Value Engineering is not defined in the SOPs nor are the required action steps explained at each point in the process where the term is mentioned.</td>
<td>• Leading value engineering practices include a formalized value engineering process that is incorporated throughout the project lifecycle for all major construction projects with tracking and reporting of value engineering activities via a database that provides real time updates and includes prioritization, activity scheduling/tracking, ownership identification and cost estimation. <strong>Recommendation:</strong> Build should consider documenting in their SOPs a formalized value engineering process for relevant projects an established dollar threshold, with tracking and reporting of value engineering activities that provides updates and includes prioritization, activity scheduling/tracking, ownership identification and cost estimation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>FY16 Audit Observation</td>
<td>KPMG Effect/Recommendation</td>
<td>BuildLACCD Management Response</td>
<td>BuildLACCD Process Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1c | Procurement Planning (Support control) | **Effect:** Informal procurement planning by the PMO and CPT for major construction projects may result in limited or incomplete identification, evaluation, and communication of major contracts, contract activities, milestones, and ownership of major procurement activities.  
**Recommendation:** Build should consider incorporating with their SOPs a formalized procurement planning process on all construction projects that includes planning for all major contracts and supplier agreements that is updated and reported on a frequent basis and includes identification of contracts, contract activities, key risks, milestones and ownership of procurement activities. | Procurement planning for major capital improvements and smaller design-bid-build construction projects procured through the Prequalified Construction Service Provider (PQSP) multiple award task order contract is performed on a weekly basis through a coordination meeting between Contracts, Construction, and Program Controls utilizing the Program P6 Milestones in the Bid & Award phase.  
The results of this meeting are a schedule matrix comparing current procurement schedules to the April 2016 Baseline Schedule. This matrix is recorded and presented to Senior Staff weekly and to the District at the weekly Touch Base update.  
Procurement planning and aggressive management of procurement schedule have resulted in an average tender-to-award duration of 112 days. This is an improvement of 39.4% over the 185-day average pre-April 2013.  
A formal Procurement Planning process will be incorporated into the SOP in the next update cycle. | Bryan Payne |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.</th>
<th>FY16 Audit Observation</th>
<th>KPMG Effect/Recommendation</th>
<th>BuildLACCD Management Response</th>
<th>BuildLACCD Process Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td><strong>Project Site Security (Support control)</strong>&lt;br&gt;There are no formal site security policies and procedures in the SOPs that identify requirements for physical site access, video cameras, background checks, etc. Although contractor responsibilities are incorporated into their respective contracts, the SOPs do not reference them. The language in the contracts is general in nature and does not include all leading practices.&lt;br&gt;Leading practices may include formalized site security policies and procedures utilized on all major construction projects with real time tracking of project personnel (professional services, construction, as well as Build and District personnel) via electronic badging system and project video cameras setup</td>
<td><strong>Effect</strong>: With informal or limited site security policies and procedures utilized on major construction projects, there may be little or no formal tracking of internal and external project site personnel, which may not be sufficiently monitored. As a result, LACCD’s bond program facilities and project information may be accessed by unauthorized individuals. <strong>Recommendation</strong>: Build and the District should consider documenting formalized site security policies and procedures for monitoring and vetting of project personnel and site access within their SOPs and District policies, as applicable.</td>
<td><strong>RE</strong>: Campus security - The District has operational policies and procedures that are implemented in coordination with the Sheriff’s department on each campus. This is not part of the PMO contractual responsibility. The District construction contracts make provisions Project Site Security – This appears to be two separate issues. Construction site security and background checks for personnel who work on the program. <strong>RE</strong>: construction site security – security of the contractually defined limits of the construction site is the responsibility of the General Contractor. This requirement is contained within their respective contracts. The methodology for securing the area is part of the contractor’s means and methods and Bryan Payne</td>
<td>Bryan Payne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>FY16 Audit Observation</td>
<td>KPMG Effect/Recommendation</td>
<td>BuildLACCD Management Response</td>
<td>BuildLACCD Process Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>throughout project sites. District Project personnel may be vetted via formal background checks and project personnel may be required to pass drug screening, as required. Site security should perform frequent and routine project site security checks that are documented and all incidences are formally documented, tracked and investigated.</td>
<td>must comply with the terms of the contract and standard industry practice. The General Contractor is also responsible for complying with the security requirements in place at the College Campus. Campus security policy is the responsibility of the College not the PMO.</td>
<td>RE: screening of professional service personnel – There is no statutory requirement for community college districts to perform background checks on the employees of independent contractors performing work for the District. Without a statutory requirement for these checks it is a District decision whether to require them or not. Build is not legally in a position to impose such a requirement and as a result cannot unilaterally issue a policy as part of its SPOs. The District has indicated a desire to begin performing background checks of professional personnel and has engaged an outside labor law firm to develop this policy. Once put in place by the District, the PMO will incorporate the policy into its SPOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As it relates to construction personnel, while section 45125.1 of the Education Code provides for background checks for contractors working with K-12 school districts, there is no parallel requirement for community college districts. In fact, in 1999, the Legislature rejected Senate Bill No. 358 that would have placed this requirement on community colleges. Again the decision to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>FY16 Audit Observation</td>
<td>KPMG Effect/Recommendation</td>
<td>BuildLACCD Management Response</td>
<td>BuildLACCD Process Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>The LACCD bond program Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for Contracts and Procurement Management do not include certain procurement requirements used by the bond program. (Low)</td>
<td><strong>Effect:</strong> Contract values serve as a driver for MATOC procurement. Lack of specified contract value limits may lead to inconsistencies in awarding contracts, and lack of transparency and adherence to the SOPs during the procurement process. In addition, a lack of documented procurement SOPs related to the use of construction orders may lead to inconsistencies during the procurement process. <strong>Recommendation:</strong> BuildLACCD should update MATOC procurement procedures to include the process for pre-qualified construction service providers. BuildLACCD should also</td>
<td>require background checks for construction personnel is one that is a District option. Until the District puts such a policy in place, Build is not in a legal position to require them. If a District policy is issued, Build will incorporate it into its SPOs.</td>
<td>Bryan Payne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OBSERVATIONS OVER PROCUREMENT REVIEW**

The Prequalified Construction Services Provider Multiple Award Task Order Contract (PQSP Bench) is a new process for bidding design-bid-build projects under $2.5 million in value. This process and the associated contracts were approved by the Board of Trustees in April 2016 just before commencement of this Performance Audit. Projects are bid to the entire bench of prequalified providers and selection goes to the lowest bidder in accordance with the provisions of Public Contract Code. Bidders may only bid up to the single-project limit of their bonding capacity. This ensures that there is no inconsistency in awarding task orders to contractors who do not have the capacity. Upon advice of counsel, enforcing specific tier assignments was deemed improper and could improperly limit
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.</th>
<th>FY16 Audit Observation</th>
<th>KPMG Effect/Recommendation</th>
<th>BuildLACCD Management Response</th>
<th>BuildLACCD Process Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>procurement of pre-qualified construction service providers. This type of MATOC procurement is currently not incorporated with the SOPs.</td>
<td>update the SOPs to include the process and requirement for the use of construction orders: the construction order contracting document should be updated to reflect the $45,000 limit and included with the SOPs.</td>
<td>competition within the bench. Accordingly, the bonding capacity limit serves as the limitation and enforcement of consistency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Parking Lot Improvements at Pierce Center for the Sciences project at LAPC was procured through a construction order, which states it is a contract option for construction less than $30,000; however, this contracting method is not defined in the SOPs and the template used is not incorporated with the SOPs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>An SOP providing guidance to the use of the PQSP Bench will be issued pending revision of SOP Section 7.0 Design-Bid-Build Construction Contracts in the next SOP revision cycle. Because bidding of design-bid-build projects including those procured under the PQSP Bench are specifically addressed in SOP Section 7.0 in accordance with Public Contract Code and the California Uniform Construction Cost Accounting Act (CUPCCAA), this risk should be deemed low.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction Orders are a form of contract used only for small informal bids. The process for procuring informal bids ($45,000 or less) is specifically addressed in SOP Section 7.2.1, page 30 in accordance with Public Contract Code Section 22032 and Board Rule 7103.08. Accordingly this risk should be deemed low.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An SOP will be issued to provide guidance on the use of Construction Orders for design-bid-build projects under $30,000 pending revision of SOP Section 7.2.1 to specifically address the use of Construction Orders in the next update cycle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>FY16 Audit Observation</td>
<td>KPMG Effect/Recommendation</td>
<td>BuildLACCD Management Response</td>
<td>BuildLACCD Process Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>Supporting documentation for procurement is at times incomplete. (Low)</td>
<td><strong>Effect:</strong> The SOPs establish required documents, confirmation and approvals necessary for procurement. When these requirements are not obtained, the procurement and award process may be incomplete and prone to errors or project complications during construction. Missing documents in a database result in no backup of the original document and delays with document retrieval. Additionally, the Program Manager may not have confirmed that there are sufficient funds available to complete the project.</td>
<td><strong>2b.1</strong> This issue is being addressed through the implementation of PMIS. Because PMIS will not allow procurement to proceed without budget authorization, this risk should be deemed low.</td>
<td>Bryan Payne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Recommendation 2b-1:</strong> The District should document all procurement confirmations, approvals and validations specific to their purpose to ensure they are official and traceable.</td>
<td><strong>2b.2</strong> This issue is being addressed through the implementation of PMIS. Because PMIS will not allow procurement to proceed without appropriate approvals in accordance with the SOP, this risk should be deemed low.</td>
<td>Jennifer Salinas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2b.3</strong> This issue is being addressed through the implementation of PMIS. Because PMIS will not allow procurement to proceed without appropriate approvals in accordance with the SOP, this risk should be deemed low.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2b.4</strong> This issue is being addressed through the implementation of PMIS. Because PMIS will not allow procurement to proceed without appropriate approvals in accordance with the SOP, this risk should be deemed low.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2b.5</strong> This issue is being addressed through the implementation of PMIS. Because PMIS will not allow procurement to proceed without</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>FY16 Audit Observation</td>
<td>KPMG Effect/Recommendation</td>
<td>BuildLACCD Management Response</td>
<td>BuildLACCD Process Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|    | 2b.3 Project budget verification forms were not validated (signed) by the Program Manager or Program Controls for the following solicitations:  
  - Pierce Automotive CIP Architect of Record (LAPC).  
  - Valley Central Plant project at Los Angeles Valley College (LAVC).  
 | **Recommendation 2b-2:** Build should incorporate the documentation requirements above with the SOPs. | appropriate approvals in accordance with the SOP, this risk should be deemed low.                                                                                                                                                                                                     |                                                                                           | Bryan Payne |
|    | 2b.4 CPT/CCL confirmation that estimates align with PMO for DBB task orders were not available for the following projects:  
  - Performing Arts Amphitheater at West Los Angeles College (WLAC)  
  - Central Plant Phase 2 (WLAC).  
 |                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                        |
|    | 2b.5 Contract Administrator, CPT and RPL confirmation of contractor compliance with all pre- and post- award requirements for DBB task orders for the following projects:  
  - Performing Arts Amphitheater (WLAC).  
  - Central Plant Phase 2 (WLAC).  
 |                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                        |
| 2c | Procurement documents do not incorporate a consistent naming convention and at times are not readily available electronically. (Low) | **Effect:** As a result of the two document filing systems and the lack of a documented and meaningful naming convention to facilitate swift location and retrieval of documents, documents are not readily available electronically.  
  - Procurement documents for fully executed contracts are stored in the DocView document control system.  
  - Working procurement documents for ongoing procurements are contained in the PlanetBids bidding system pending full execution and | Procurement documents for fully executed contracts are stored in the DocView document control system. Working procurement documents for ongoing procurements are contained in the PlanetBids bidding system pending full execution and |                        |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.</th>
<th>FY16 Audit Observation</th>
<th>KPMG Effect/Recommendation</th>
<th>BuildLACCD Management Response</th>
<th>BuildLACCD Process Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procurement documents were difficult to locate in DocView, which serves as the bond program’s primary document repository. No procedure or naming convention is incorporated in the SOPs to facilitate easy location reference and searchable terms of specific documents, whether maintained in DocView or located elsewhere.</td>
<td>required for the audit needed to be located and retrieved by Build and subsequently uploaded to DocView or sent to the auditors to accommodate the audit requests. The lack of a formally documented naming convention and searchable terms incorporated with the SOPs also made searching for required documents in DocView more difficult for Build team members. Additionally, the lack of a naming convention also attributes to overlooking a document that actually has been uploaded to DocView and further complicates and delays document retrieval. <strong>Recommendation:</strong> Build should retain all relevant procurement documents based on the SOPs and track submission into DocView or other meaningful repository to ensure location, availability and completeness at any given point of the Procurement process (as well as other processes). Incorporating a formal naming convention will also help to improve document accessibility.</td>
<td>storage in DocView. Also, a redundant paper procurement file is maintained as a backup. The samples chosen were at different stages in the procurement lifecycle. Consequently, some documents available in PlanetBids were not available in DocView. Because the entire procurement file is uploaded to DocView after Board award and execution of the contract, this risk should be deemed low. A revised naming convention and cross-reference system will be issued in the next Contracts SOP update cycle.</td>
<td>Bryan Payne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Certain invoiced amounts do not comply with the contractual terms and</strong></td>
<td><strong>Effect:</strong> The District may be subject to overcharges or unwarranted liens due to lacking and/or</td>
<td><strong>The contracts with upcoming expiration dates will be allowed to expire.</strong></td>
<td>Chris Bushra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>FY16 Audit Observation</td>
<td>KPMG Effect/Recommendation</td>
<td>BuildLACCD Management Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>conditions, and supporting documentation is incomplete. (Low)</strong></td>
<td>complying with proper contract terms and conditions</td>
<td>The professional services contracts in the 1000 series noted are in the process of being updated and amended; these provisions will also be addressed in that amendment. This amendment is expected to be completed by the end of November 2016.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Seven invoices in the amount of $203,134 did not include conditional or unconditional waivers as required by the contract terms. According to the District, waivers are not required for professional services and do not apply. However, this should be reflected in the contract. (This is a repeat observation.)</td>
<td><strong>Recommendation 3:</strong> The District should ensure appropriate contract terms related to contractor and vendor billings are executed and subsequently followed.</td>
<td>All other professional services contracts carrying these provisions will be amended according to Recommendation 3 in Q1 2017.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Six invoices in the amount of $104,032 did not include a narrative progress report as required by the contract terms. According to the District, the invoices are for professional services and a narrative progress report does not apply. However, this should be reflected in the contract.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX A – LIST OF ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AECOM</td>
<td>Program Manager or AECOM Technical Services, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Architect/Engineering (firm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIA</td>
<td>American Institute of Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOT or Board</td>
<td>Los Angeles Community College District Program Management Office, a blended program management team consisting of URS or AECOM (after April 4, 2013), other consultants, and members of the District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BuildLACCD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CII</td>
<td>Construction Industry Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Construction Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COI</td>
<td>Conflicts of Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPM</td>
<td>College Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>College Project Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB</td>
<td>Design-Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBB</td>
<td>Design-Bid-Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCOC</td>
<td>District Citizens’ Oversight Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DocView</td>
<td>Document records and storage system maintained by Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC</td>
<td>Estimated Cost at Completion (for a project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELAC</td>
<td>East Los Angeles College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAS</td>
<td>Government Auditing Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAO</td>
<td>Government Accountability Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>General Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOR</td>
<td>Inspector of Record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPMG</td>
<td>KPMG LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACC</td>
<td>Los Angeles City College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACCD or District</td>
<td>Los Angeles Community College District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAHC</td>
<td>Los Angeles Harbor College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAPC</td>
<td>Los Angeles Pierce College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LASC</td>
<td>Los Angeles South College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LASWC</td>
<td>Los Angeles Southwest College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATTC</td>
<td>Los Angeles Trade Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAVC</td>
<td>Los Angeles Valley College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATOC</td>
<td>Multiple Award Task Order Contracts Technical Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCIP</td>
<td>Owner Controlled Insurance Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM or PMO</td>
<td>Program Manager or Program Management Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMI</td>
<td>Program Management Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMIS</td>
<td>Program Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMP</td>
<td>Program Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOPs</td>
<td>Standard Operating Procedures Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touchpoints</td>
<td>Program Touchpoints Handbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UII</td>
<td>Universal Inquiry Interface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URS</td>
<td>URS Corporation (Program Manager from March 2007 to April 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VE</td>
<td>Value Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLAC</td>
<td>West Los Angeles College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B – LIST OF PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LACC</td>
<td>01C-108</td>
<td>Da Vinci Hall Modernization</td>
<td>In Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACC</td>
<td>01C-134</td>
<td>Student Services Center</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACC</td>
<td>01C-146</td>
<td>Physical Plant (M&amp;O) Building</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELAC</td>
<td>02E-218</td>
<td>Academic Network Integrated Backbone</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELAC</td>
<td>02E-231</td>
<td>Campus Student Center/Book Store Complex</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAHC</td>
<td>03H-350.03</td>
<td>Infrastructure/Land &amp; Hardscape/Security</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMC</td>
<td>04M-421</td>
<td>Campus Demand Side Management</td>
<td>In Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAPC</td>
<td>05P-502</td>
<td>Life Science, Chemistry, Physics Building Renovation</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAPC</td>
<td>05P-537</td>
<td>Stadium ADA Improvements</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LASC</td>
<td>06S-618</td>
<td>School of Math &amp; Sciences (Lecture Lab)</td>
<td>In Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATTC</td>
<td>07T-701</td>
<td>South Campus</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATTC</td>
<td>07T-702</td>
<td>Learning Resources Center</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAVC</td>
<td>08V-801</td>
<td>Media and Performing Arts Center</td>
<td>In Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAVC</td>
<td>08V-837</td>
<td>Athletic Training Facility-Baseball Stadium Bleacher</td>
<td>In Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLAC</td>
<td>09W-953</td>
<td>Central Plant Phase 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>In Design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C – SUMMARY OF MANAGEMENT’S PLANS
(Improvements reported by BuildLACCD, and not subject to audit)²

The current PM has continued many initiatives to improve the bond program under its current leadership. Below are examples of leading practices that started during and after the period of audit, as represented by management, but have not yet been audited by KPMG:

Program Improvements:

• 18 Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) were created or revised
• Over 140 bond program forms were reviewed and/or revised for enhanced efficiencies
• Program level and college level Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) criteria were reviewed and revised for improved reporting
• CPT staff training on accounting principles and fiscal year-end accrual process was enhanced
• Average major procurement tender time is currently 112 days
  – 3.4% improvement from 116 day average reported on prior performance audit
  – 6.7% improvement from 120 day average reported in April 2015
  – 39.4% improvement from 185 day average pre-April 2013
• Zero protests filed in 2016
• Automated email reminders were created and went live in June 2016 to encourage vendors and subcontractors to submit invoices to the program for payment in a timely manner
• The District worked with the BuildLACCD PMO to set up a reserve fund and put it in place in May 2016 to help improve the vendor payment process in order to help reduce the number of payment processing days
• The PMO encouraged prime contractors to pay their subcontractors using electronic funds transfer and several have accommodated as per payment process improvement recommendation from Invoice Payment and Processing Review (IPPR) conducted by Deloitte in June 2016

² KPMG did not audit these “leading practices” against PM represented performance criteria.
• The PMO has been working on improving throughput for vendor payment processing. Starting in January through June 2016, the number of days from receipt of invoice to payment to vendors had been decreased:
  – General Contractor vendors invoice receipt to payment days had declined from 30 to 28 days
  – Multiple Award Task Order Contract (MATOC) vendors invoice receipt to payment days had declined from 27 to 17 days

• In order to improve compliance and expedite approvals, beginning October 2016 Build LACCD PMO has implemented eight electronic workflow processes in PMIS. A coordinated team (led by Accounting, Contracts, Project Controls) developed these workflows to automate approval and posting of the following:
  – Master Service Agreements
  – Master Purchase Agreements
  – Professional Services Agreements
  – Purchase (PO) and Task Orders (TO)
  – Construction Contracts
  – Construction Change Orders
  – PO and TO Financial Close outs
  – Invoice approvals for all of the above
### 2014-2015 Observations and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014-2015 Observations and Recommendations</th>
<th>Management’s Response and Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Scheduling</strong></td>
<td>Management’s October 2016 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. The District should update their monthly Dashboard reporting practices to include schedule variances, substantial completion dates, and correct reference to source documentation.</td>
<td>1a. Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. The District should start tracking individual line item schedule changes on a monthly basis for purposes of conducting their own internal schedule variance analysis.</td>
<td>1b. Open.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. The District should create and implement uniform scheduling activity codes for project scheduling purposes.</td>
<td>1c. Closed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The PMO Project Controls team has taken great measures to implement new fields in the Program’s P6 scheduling software to capture the Contract NTP and Contract Finish for active Construction projects. Variances are reviewed on a monthly basis. Implementation of a new change management log template incorporating additional data will allow increased visibility on approved contract duration changes.*

1c. Closed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014-2015 Observations and Recommendations</th>
<th>Management’s Response and Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Budget and Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>Management’s October 2016 Update:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. The District should complete the revised project baseline effort for all projects.</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In April 2016 the Program performed a bottoms up estimate at each campus on the active projects. The revised baseline was presented to the District and FMPOC but not incorporated into the LACCD Dashboard at the request of the District. Starting in October 2016, the PMO kicked off a second Estimate at Completion (EAC) update exercise to confirm each active project’s bottoms up estimate, and refine where necessary with the intent of incorporating a new baseline by January 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015 Observations and Recommendations</td>
<td>Management’s Response and Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Project Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. The District should ensure appropriate contract terms related to contractor and vendor billings are executed and subsequently followed.</td>
<td><strong>Management’s October 2016 Update:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The contracts with upcoming expiration dates will be allowed to expire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The professional services contracts in the 1000 series noted are in the process of being updated and amended; these provisions will also be addressed in that amendment. This amendment is expected to be completed by the end of November 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All other professional services contracts carrying these provisions will be amended according to Recommendation 3 in Q1 2017.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Use of Contingency Reserve
Subject: **AUTHORIZE USE OF $2,338,031 FROM CONTINGENCY RESERVE TO AUGMENT COLLEGE BUDGETS**

In the General Fund, authorize the distribution of $2,338,031 from the contingency reserve account as recommended by the Chancellor to those colleges below who were able to hire full time faculty above their requirement in order for the Los Angeles Community College District to meet its Full Time Faculty Obligation (FON) for Fall 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th># over hiring requirement</th>
<th>Budget Augmentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harbor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>203,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>508,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>406,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,219,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,338,031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background:** The October 16, 2015 advanced apportionment memo from the State Chancellor’s office reported the Los Angeles Community College’s Fall 2016 Full Time Faculty Hiring obligation number to be 1,696.69. This 167 increase over the prior year, coupled with projected attrition required the District to hire 242 full time faculty members in one year. This proposal authorizes augmentation of the budgets of those colleges that were able to hire above their requirement in order for the District to meet its Fall 2016 FON. The District met the Fall 2016 FON with 1 above the required number.

**FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:** This action increases the budgets at the colleges by $2,338,031 and reduces the Contingency Reserve by the same, leaving a balance in the Contingency Reserve of $19,931,349.

**REQUIRES FIVE (5) AFFIRMATIVE VOTES**
D. Expenditure Data and Costs Per FTES
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Unrestricted General Fund
2014-15 COST PER FTES
Full-Time Faculty

- City: 1,380
- East: 1,167
- Harbor: 1,422
- Mission: 1,070
- Pierce: 1,221
- Southwest: 1,221
- Trade-Tech: 1,357
- Valley: 1,208
- West: 1,245

Average: 1,250

Average - Cost of Colleges Only (Excludes ITV, ESC, Districtwide)
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Unrestricted General Fund
2015-16 COST PER FTES
Full-Time Faculty

Average: 1,328

City: 1,491
East: 1,172
Harbor: 1,495
Mission: 1,254
Pierce: 1,390
Southwest: 1,352
Trade-Tech: 1,382
Valley: 1,323
West: 1,239

Average - Cost of Colleges Only (Excludes ITV, ESC, Districtwide)
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Unrestricted General Fund
2014-15 COST PER FTES
Academic Administrators

Average: 117

City: 91
East: 111
Harbor: 158
Mission: 175
Pierce: 98
Southwest: 178
Trade-Tech: 105
Valley: 113
West: 121

Average - Cost of Colleges Only (Excludes ITV, ESC, Districtwide)
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Unrestricted General Fund
2015-16 COST PER FTES
Academic Administrators

Average - Cost of Colleges Only (Excludes ITV, ESC, Districtwide)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade-Tech</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: 106
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Unrestricted General Fund
2014-15 COST PER FTES
Part-Time Faculty

Average - Cost of Colleges Only (Excludes ITV, ESC, Districtwide)

Average: 942
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Unrestricted General Fund
2015-16 COST PER FTES
Part-Time Faculty

Average - Cost of Colleges Only (Excludes ITV, ESC, Districtwide)
Average - Cost of Colleges Only (Excludes ITV, ESC, Districtwide)
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Unrestricted General Fund
2015-16 COST PER FTES
Classified Management

Average - Cost of Colleges Only (Excludes ITV, ESC, Districtwide)
Los Angeles Community College District

Unrestricted General Fund

2014-15 Cost per FTES

Classified Employees

Average: 734

City: 761
East: 633
Harbor: 839
Mission: 895
Pierce: 674
Southwest: 833
Trade-Tech: 765
Valley: 686
West: 852

Average - Cost of Colleges Only (Excludes ITV, ESC, Districtwide)
Average - Cost of Colleges Only (Excludes ITV, ESC, Districtwide)
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Unrestricted General Fund
2014-15 COST PER FTES
Student Workers and Other Employees

Average - Cost of Colleges Only (Excludes ITV, ESC, Districtwide)
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Unrestricted General Fund
2015-16 COST PER FTES
Student Workers and Other Employees

Average: 61

City: 27
East: 78
Harbor: 78
Mission: 44
Pierce: 74
Southwest: 71
Trade-Tech: 54
Valley: 49
West: 62

Average - Cost of Colleges Only (Excludes ITV, ESC, Districtwide)
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Unrestricted General Fund
2014-15 COST PER FTES
Non-Salaries

Average - Cost of Colleges Only (Excludes ITV, ESC, Districtwide)
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Unrestricted General Fund
2015-16 COST PER FTES
Non-Salaries

Average - Cost of Colleges Only (Excludes ITV, ESC, Districtwide)
LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Unrestricted General Fund
2014-15 COST PER FTES
Full-Time Faculty

Average: 1,250

City: 1,380
East: 1,167
Harbor: 1,422
Mission: 1,070
Pierce: 1,221
Southwest: 1,221
Trade-Tech: 1,357
Valley: 1,208
West: 1,245

Average - Cost of Colleges Only (Excludes ITV, ESC, Districtwide)
Average - Cost of Colleges Only (Excludes ITV, ESC, Districtwide)