



Performance Audit Report
2006 Measure B, 2012 Measure J, and 2020 Measure Y
General Obligation Bond Funds
June 30, 2023

Oakland Unified School District



March 29, 2024

Board of Education, Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee, and Management of the
Oakland Unified School District
Oakland, California

Subject: Measure Y, Measure J and Measure B Construction Bond Funds Performance Audit Report for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2023.

This report presents the results of our performance audit of the Oakland Unified School District's (OUSD or the District) 2020 Measure Y, 2012 Measure J and 2006 Measure B General Obligation School Facilities Bond (Bond Program) as required by District objectives, California Proposition 39, the "Smaller Classes, Safer Schools and Financial Accountability Act" (Proposition 39), California Constitution (State Constitution) Article XIII A, California Education Code (Education Code) Section 15272, and Appendix A contained in the *2022-2023 Guide for Annual Audits of K-12 Local Education Agencies and State Compliance Reporting* issued by the California Education Audit Appeals Panel. These California State (State) requirements specify that the proceeds from the sale of school facilities bonds are expended only on the specific projects listed in the proposition authorizing the sale of bonds (Listed Projects).

Both the State Constitution and Education Code require an annual independent performance audit to verify bond proceeds are used on Listed Projects. Finally, Senate Bill 1473, "School facilities bond proceeds: performance audits" (SB 1473), approved by the Governor on September 23, 2010, amended California Education Code to add Section 15286, which requires the annual performance audits to be conducted under the *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States.

Executive Summary

We conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. The performance audit objectives, scope, methodology, audit results, and a summary of the views of responsible district officials are included in the report body.

Performance audit procedures covered the period from July 1, 2022, through June 30, 2023. Based on the performance audit procedures performed and the results obtained, we have met our audit objectives. We conclude that for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2023, bond proceeds were used only for listed projects under the 2020 Measure Y, 2012 Measure J and 2006 Measure B. Further details and clarifications are within the body of our report.

The project planning began in April and May, 2023. The audit team was on-site and remote for fieldwork during December 2023 through March 2024 to review documentation covering payment procedures, contracting and procurement, and design and construction, interviews with selected project managers, reconciling and reviewing budgets, board legislative information, OUSD Facilities Procedures Manual, and reports presented to the Citizens' Board Oversight Committee, and reviewing supporting documents for the selected change orders and amendments. We reviewed documentation covering 54 percent of total vendor expenditures and 14 percent of salary expenditures of Measure B, Measure J and Measure Y.

Based on our assessment, we identified several good management practices as described below:

- The District utilized other revenue sources to maximize the impact of Measure Y, Measure J and Measure B funds.
- The District reported the historical expenditure date for the projects and separated Measure J, Measure B, and Measure Y expenditures.
- Senior management of the Bond Program was cooperative, responsive, and maintained the institutional knowledge that is often lost with the turnover of senior District officials.
- The District submitted a Contract Justification Form to the Board that summarized relevant procurement process information. This form included relevant vendor information on how the District selected vendors, a summary of vendor services, a determination of competitive pricing if the contract was not competitively bid, and competitive bid exceptions when applicable.
- While out-of-date, the District was able to provide a standardized items list for Bond Program materials procurement.
- Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee (CBOC) meeting recorded videos were posted on the District website, and the meeting minutes included links to the relevant documentation.
- The District continuously updates the Program Procedures Manual, which includes updated policies and procedures over the areas addressed in this report and the prior year's performance audit report. The Program Procedures Manual is available on the District website for all key stakeholders to review.
- The District adopted two Capital Spending Plans dated January 2021 and June 2023 to revise the August 2018 and April 2021 Spending Plans (project budgets) to reflect the current state of the projects.
- Complete and bid and procurement documents were readily available in a central location.
- Information presented to CBOC reconciles with the District's accounting records.
- The District provided a signed payroll certification for 100% bond funded employees.
- The District's financial reporting to CBOC has continued improving and includes details necessary for the key stakeholders to analyze the schedule and budgetary information at the program and project level.

We continued to evaluate the effectiveness of internal controls to analyze the School Construction Program and offer those charged with District governance and oversight information to improve program performance and operations. The District has demonstrated meaningful improvements over internal controls by resolving prior-year observations.

We provided improvement recommendations related to our observations for expenditure management and controls, adherence to design and construction cost budgets, adherence to design and construction schedules and timelines, financial reporting and internal controls, payment procedures, change order and claims procedures, bidding and procurement procedures, best practices for procurement of materials and services, conflict of interest, compliance with state laws and guidelines, and board policy.

Management remains responsible for the proper implementation and operation of an adequate internal control system. Due to the inherent limitations of any internal control structure, errors or irregularities may occur and not be detected. Also, projections of any evaluation of the internal control structure to future periods are subject to the risk that the internal control structure may become inadequate because of changes in conditions or the degree of compliance with the procedures may deteriorate.

This report is intended solely for the use of the District's Board of Education, management, and the Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee. This report is not intended to be, and should not be, used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Eide Sully LLP".

Menlo Park, California
March 29, 2024

Oakland Unified School District
2006 Measure B, 2012 Measure J, and 2020 Measure Y Funds

Table of Contents
June 30, 2023

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. Oakland Unified School District Approved Bond Funds	1
B. California State Requirements	2

OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

3

AUDIT RESULT

Conduct a Performance Audit (CAPA) for Measure J and B	4
Special Outcome No. 1 - Adherence to Design and Construction Cost Budgets	5
Special Outcome No. 2 - Adherence to Design and Construction Schedules and Timelines	5
Special Outcome No. 3 - Financial Reporting and Internal Controls	5
Special Outcome No. 4 - Payment Procedures	5
Special Outcome No. 5 - Change Order and Claim Procedures	6
Special Outcome No. 6 - Bidding and Procurement Procedures	6
Special Outcome No. 7 - Best Practices for Procurement of Materials and Services	6
Special Outcome No. 8 and 9 - Conflict of Interest and Compliance with State Laws and Guidelines and Board Policy	6
Present Audit Findings	7
Conduct A Performance Audit (CAPA)	7
CAPA No. 1	9
Specific Outcome No.1 – Adherence to Design and Construction Cost Budgets	9
Observation 1.1	9
Observation 1.2	9
Specific Outcome No.2 – Adherence to Design and Construction Schedules and Timelines	10
Observation 2.1	10
Observation 2.2	11
Specific Outcome No.3 – Financial Reporting and Internal Controls	12
Observation 3	12
Specific Outcome No.4 – Payment Procedures	13
Observation 4	13
Specific Outcome No.5 – Change Order and Claim Procedures	13
Observation 5.1	13
Observation 5.2	15
Specific Outcome No.6 – Bidding and Procurement Procedures	16
Observation 6.1	16
Observation 6.2	16
Specific Outcome No.7 – Best Practices for Procurement of Materials and Services	17
Observation 7	17
Specific Outcome No.8 and 9 – Conflict of Interest and Compliance with State Laws and Guidelines and Board Policy	18
Observation 8 and 9.1	19
Observation 8 and 9.2	19

REPORTING VIEWS OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICIALS

20

Appendix A - Interviews Performed

22

Appendix B - Reviews of Prior Year Audit

23

Appendix C - Change Order and Claim Procedures

28

**Oakland Unified School District
2006 Measure B, 2012 Measure J, and 2020 Measure Y Funds**

**Background Information
For the Year Ended June 30, 2023**

A. Oakland Unified School District Approved Bond Funds

On June 6, 2006, Oakland voters approved the School Facilities Improvement Bond of 2006 (Measure B), authorizing the District to issue \$435 million of general obligation bonds to finance the school facilities projects specified and listed in the Bond Project List. The funds intend to “repair and modernize elementary, middle and high schools and pre-schools, including renovating classrooms, restrooms and other facilities to meet current safety standards, repairing electrical, plumbing and other building systems; and building libraries, classrooms, and science and computer labs.”

On November 6, 2012, Oakland voters approved the School Facilities Improvement Bond of 2012 (Measure J). Measure J authorized the District to issue \$475 million to “improve the quality of Oakland schools and school facilities to better prepare students for college and jobs, to upgrade science labs, classrooms, computers, and technology, improve student safety and security, repair bathrooms, electrical systems, plumbing, and sewer lines, improve energy efficiency and earthquake safety.”

On November 2, 2020, Oakland voters approved Measure Y. Measure Y authorized the District to issue \$735 million for classroom repair and school safety improvements, including upgrading classrooms, science labs, and technology; improving student safety and security; repairing bathrooms, electrical systems, and plumbing/sewers; and improving energy efficiency and earthquake safety.

Bond Program accounting records show total expenditures during the 2023 fiscal year of \$68.7 million. Measure Y Bond Program expenditures were \$56.6 million, Measure J Bond Program expenditures were \$7.8 million, and Measure B Bond Program expenditures were \$4.3 million.

As of June 30, 2023, the collective bond program had unspent budgets of \$169.1 million as compared to amounts authorized, but unsold of \$550 million and fund balance of \$162.9 million. Of this total, Measure Y includes \$671.5 million, Measure J includes \$32.4 million, and Measure B includes \$8.9 million. Measure B had outstanding construction commitments of \$11,600, while Measure J had outstanding construction commitments of \$3.9 million and Measure Y had outstanding construction commitments of \$53 million as of June 30, 2023.

The District sold the final series of bonds under Measure B in August 2016. The August 2020 series of bonds is the final issuance under Measure J. In November 2020, the District received authorization to issue \$735 million of general obligation bonds for Measure Y. On October 1, 2021, the District sold first two Measure Y series A and B in amount of \$185,000,000. EB noted the District subsequently issued \$185,000,000 general obligation bonds under Measure Y on November 22, 2023.

B. California State Requirements

A Construction Bond Program Performance Audit is required for the District's Measure J, Measure B, and Measure Y Construction Bonds by Proposition 39, State Constitution Article XIII A, and Education Code Section 15272. These requirements specify that the proceeds from the sale of school facilities bonds can be expended only on Listed Projects. The State Constitution and Education Code require an annual independent performance audit to verify that Bond proceeds were used on Listed Projects. Finally, SB 1473, approved by the Governor on September 23, 2010, amended the California Education Code to add Section 15286, which requires an annual performance audit to be conducted per *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States.

California voters passed proposition 39 on November 7, 2000. Proposition 39 amended provisions to the California Constitution and the California Education Code. The purpose and intent of the initiative were "to implement class size reduction, to ensure that our children learn in a secure and safe environment, and to ensure that school districts are accountable for prudent and responsible spending for school facilities." It provided for the following amendments to the California Constitution and California Education Code:

1. To provide an exception to the limitation on ad valorem property taxes and the two-third vote requirements to allow school districts, community college districts, and county offices of education to equip our schools for the 21st Century, to provide our children with smaller classes, and to ensure our children's safety by repairing, building, furnishing and equipping school facilities;
2. To require school district boards, community college boards, and county offices of education to evaluate the safety, class size reduction, and information technology needs in developing a list of specific projects to present to the voters;
3. To ensure that before they vote, voters will be given a list of specific projects their bond money will be used for;
4. To require an annual, independent financial audit of the proceeds from the sale of the school facilities bonds until all of the proceeds have been expended for the specified school facilities projects; and
5. To ensure that the proceeds from the sale of school facilities bonds are used for specified school facilities projects only, and not for teacher and administrator salaries and other school operating expenses, by requiring an annual independent performance audit to ensure that the funds have been expended on specific projects only."

**Oakland Unified School District
2006 Measure B, 2012 Measure J, and 2020 Measure Y Funds**

**Objectives, Scope, and Methodology
For the Year Ended June 30, 2023**

The primary objective of the performance audit included verification of management’s compliance with Proposition 39, which required that bond proceeds only be used for school facilities projects that were listed with the Bond. The District created the Measure Y, Measure J and Measure B Bond funds under Proposition 39, which requires the District to expend these funds proceeds only on Listed Projects and not for school operating expenses.

We conducted this Bond Program performance audit following *Government Auditing Standards* for Performance Audits issued by the Comptroller General of the United States (GAGAS), and Appendix A of the *2022-23 Guide for Annual Audits of K-12 Local Education Agencies and State Compliance Reporting* published by the Education Audit Appeals Panel. As required by these standards, we planned and performed the audit to obtain sufficient and appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. Reasonable assurance is a high level of assurance but is not absolute assurance and therefore is not a guarantee that an audit conducted in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America (GAAS), and in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*, and Appendix A of the *2022-23 Guide for Annual Audits of K-12 Local Education Agencies and State Compliance Reporting* published by the Education Audit Appeals Panel, as applicable, will always detect a material noncompliance when it exists. Misstatements, including omissions, can arise from fraud or error and are considered material if there is a substantial likelihood that, individually or in the aggregate, they would influence the judgment made by a reasonable user based on the financial statements. We have met our audit objective based on the performance audit procedures performed and the results obtained. Performance audit procedures covered July 1, 2022, through June 30, 2023.

Management remains responsible for the proper implementation and operation of an adequate internal control system. Due to the inherent limitations of any internal control structure, errors or irregularities may occur and not be detected. Also, projections of any evaluation of the internal control structure to future periods are subject to the risk that the internal control structure may become inadequate because of changes in conditions or that the degree of compliance with the procedures may deteriorate.

This performance audit did not constitute an audit of financial statements in accordance with Government Auditing Standards. Eide Bailly was not engaged to and did not render an opinion on District internal controls. The full list of performance audit objectives (as specified by the District and agreed upon for this performance audit) and methodology applied included the following:

**Oakland Unified School District
2006 Measure B, 2012 Measure J, and 2020 Measure Y Funds**

**Objectives, Scope, and Methodology
For the Year Ended June 30, 2023**

Performance Audit for Measures B, J, and Y

We reviewed the Bond Program’s financial records and expenditures to verify that funds were used for approved Bond Program purposes as outlined in the ballot language, bond documents, board-approved listed projects, and proposition 39 requirements. We reviewed the Bond Program’s financial records and expenditures by obtaining the annual financial reports and comparing the balances to the District’s detailed accounting records. We analyzed control processes, tested the bond program expenditure cycle, and sampled supporting documentation to validate internal controls. We selected all vendor transactions considered individually significant based on the auditor’s materiality and at least one transaction from all vendors. We tested 54 percent of aggregated total vendor expenditures in the amount of \$37.3 million, consisting of 85 transactions from Measure Y totaling \$28.7 million, 67 transactions from Measure J totaling \$5.1 million, and 23 transactions from Measure B totaling \$3.5 million.

These transactions included payments for contractors, employees, and journal entries. We performed our testing procedures to verify:

- Expenditures were for “listed projects.”
- The District obtained approval of payment applications and invoices.
- Expenditures complied with the approved contract, purchase order, or other procurement documentation.
- Expenses were recorded accurately in the District’s books and records in the proper period and segregated from District’s operations and administration.
- Expenditures met allocability and allowability requirements for allowance and contingency usage per sampled job contract language.
- The District paid expenditures within contractual agreements of 45 days.

Payroll related expenditures were \$3.4 million, which includes salaries of District employees working in support of bond projects, and related benefits. We analytically analyzed the payroll accounting records to identify significant unusual transactions, including verification that related benefits are reasonable in relation to other District employees. We further selected a sample of six fully bond-funded employees and four nonrecurring payroll transactions. We verified that payroll transactions were reasonably allocated to the bond program, and that adequate supporting documentation evidencing internal controls was present.

We communicated our audit plan with bond program senior management and are available to meet with District personnel and the Citizens' Bond Oversight as requested.

We conducted interviews with key personnel responsible for implementing the bond program. This included individuals in senior management and staff positions responsible for overseeing the planning, design, and construction work associated with the projects, such as team members of OUSD’s program management team, OUSD’s facilities and administration, and contractor project management. We also interacted with the accounting staff responsible for monitoring and implementing the financial controls over the programs. A complete list of the individuals interviewed is included in Appendix A.

**Oakland Unified School District
2006 Measure B, 2012 Measure J, and 2020 Measure Y Funds**

**Objectives, Scope, and Methodology
For the Year Ended June 30, 2023**

Specific Outcome No.1. Adherence to Design and Construction Cost Budgets

We reviewed management’s process for the development and adherence to design and construction budgets on bond-funded projects in the facilities’ construction program to gather and test data to determine compliance and measure the effectiveness of controls.

We reviewed the reconciliation of projects for which bond funds were expended to projects approved by the Board, analyzed the reconciliation of projects approved by the Board to projects on the approved facilities master plan, and reviewed the reconciliation of the facilities master plan on the approved project lists for Proposition 39.

Specific Outcome No.2. Adherence to Design and Construction Schedules and Timelines

We reviewed the methods used by bond program management to track the schedule of available resources and expenditures for all projects and to plan each building project per the availability of funds. We walked through existing schedule performance tracking methods, Bond fund expenditure schedules, and sample supporting documentation for expenditures and cost controls performance. Audit procedures included assessment of performance against schedule and controls needed for reliable schedule reporting.

Specific Outcome No.3. Financial Reporting and Internal Controls

We evaluated the actions taken by bond program management to apply policies and procedures that accomplish the Bond Program schedule, scope management, and performance goals. We reviewed Bond Program reporting to provide current, accurate, and complete cost, schedule, and budgetary information to Program stakeholders. We analyzed financial reporting and controls based on interviews and information gathered during the project audit.

This analysis also reviewed the cost, schedule, and budgetary reporting and review methodologies.

Specific Outcome No.4. Payment Processing

We verified that the District was compliant with its policies and procedures related to Proposition 39 expenditures and payments for the period. We documented the use of Bond Program funds and segregation of these funds for Bond Program purposes, traced Bond funds received by OUSD and reconciled amounts received with amounts expended, and verified that these funds were spent for Bond Program purposes. We verified payment approval and cost accounting control design and operation. We conducted a review for payment per contract terms. We gathered and tested data to determine compliance and measure the effectiveness of payment controls. We analyzed processes to review and approve contractor charges to prevent excessive fees and overpayments, and We examined payment applications to assess the adequacy of supporting documentation.

Objectives, Scope, and Methodology
For the Year Ended June 30, 2023

Specific Outcome No.5. Change Order and Claim Procedures

We reviewed change order documentation for compliance with Public Contracting Code, California school construction state requirements, and other regulations. We evaluated controls and activities to manage change orders. We reviewed contracts to understand allowable charges and reimbursable costs related to change orders. We analyzed policies and procedures covering the review and approval of contractor change orders to identify potential exposures. Specific consideration was given to change order cause, responsibility, and pricing.

We reviewed policies and procedures to verify whether documentation exists before approval of change orders and confirm that the District obtained the required approvals. Additionally, we evaluated and reviewed the processes used to effectively communicate potential claims and mitigate claims risk.

Specific Outcome No.6. Bidding and Procurement Procedures

We validated support to ensure sole-source procurement was documented, cost justification was available, and the District obtained the required approvals. For competitive bids, we verified compliance with the California school construction state requirements, Public Contracting Code, and State and other Professional Services Contract relevant laws and regulations. Additionally, we evaluated procurement controls to apply competitive and compliant contracting practices.

Specific Outcome No.7. Best Practices for Procurement of Materials and Services

We determined whether bond program management had and used a standardized items list and educational specifications for Bond Program materials procurement to identify facilities' material requirements. We assessed whether materials requirements were available to project architects and designers and verified whether materials specifications were used in procurements and provided to all bidders during the procurement process. Review for cost-benefit analysis performed in setting materials standards and district management approvals required significant materials specification changes.

Specific Outcome Nos. 8 and 9. Conflict of Interest and Compliance with State Laws and Guidelines and Board Policy

We analyzed for compliance with selected relevant state laws and regulations regarding school district facilities programs. We performed a risk assessment to identify requirements and regulations to which the District may be subject. The California Schools Accounting Manual (CSAM), Education Code, Public Contract Code, Government Code, California Code of Regulations (Title 21 and Title 24), and other appropriate regulations are considered within our analysis. We selected specific laws and regulations that are considered the highest risk for further review to assess the District's compliance. This analysis does not form a legal opinion or a complete analysis for compliance with all applicable state laws and regulations.

**Oakland Unified School District
2006 Measure B, 2012 Measure J, and 2020 Measure Y Funds**

**Audit Results
For the Year Ended June 30, 2023**

Present Audit Findings

We developed the performance audit conclusions as the engagement progressed. A draft report was prepared at the end of the engagement for distribution and comment before final report issuance. Our report found areas of effective practice and areas needing improvement within the framework of each of the significant scope areas named above. Good practices for each scope area are also presented. It is the responsibility of management, and those charged with governance, to decide whether to accept the risk associated with these conditions because of cost or other considerations.

As required by *Government Auditing Standards*, the elements of a finding are criteria, condition, context, and recommendation are included in the following pages. The audit recommendations sections include management's response. We considered management's response to our audit findings for reasonableness and consistency with our knowledge of the District, but management's response is not subject to audit procedures.

The deliverables provided to the bond program management are produced collaboratively and objectively, and meaningfully convey the performance audit results to achieve maximum benefit to the District, its Administration, the Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee, and the Governing Board. We are committed to the Oakland Unified School District and are continually available to consult about this report.

Performance Audit

We reviewed expenditures for compliance with the Bond's requirements for listed projects to ensure that only allowable costs were allocated to the Bond Program, under *Government Auditing Standards* for performance audits and the *2022-2023 Guide for Annual Audits of K-12 Local Education Agencies and State Compliance Reporting Appendix A, Local School Construction Bond Audits*. The conclusions of our work are summarized as follows:

In all significant respects, the District has properly accounted for the expenditures of Measure B, J, and Y, bond funds and that such expenditures were made for listed projects. Furthermore, the District expended bond funds for salaries only to the extent employees perform administrative oversight work on construction projects. However, although applicable only to specific split-funded employees, the District does not have a documented basis for distributing salary between the narrow category of bond compliant construction projects, and routine everyday school facilities administrator expenses. We evaluated and reviewed the funds used for administrator salaries only to the extent they performed administrative oversight work on Measure B, J, or Y compliant construction projects, as allowable per Opinion 04-110 issued on November 9, 2004, by the State of California Attorney General. That opinion states that "a school district may use Proposition 39 school bond proceeds to pay the salaries of district employees to the extent they perform administrative oversight work on construction projects authorized by a voter-approved bond measure."

The total salary, which includes payroll and related benefits, charged to the bond program was \$3.4 million. Twenty-one people are full-time bond program employees. Two people are allocated between the bond fund (80%) and the general fund (20%). This matter is limited to the two cross-funded employees. Employees performing specific limited tasks, such as cleaning a site before it may be occupied, are allocated to the bond program based on actual hours worked.

**Oakland Unified School District
2006 Measure B, 2012 Measure J, and 2020 Measure Y Funds**

**Audit Results
For the Year Ended June 30, 2023**

We interviewed 11 out of 23, fully funded or cross-funded employees, and reviewed documents applicable to six employees' positions and responsibilities. We also reviewed timesheets for non-recurring payroll expenditures. We further reviewed the District's payroll certification signed by the Deputy Chief for the fully funded employees certifying that 100 percent allocation of their payroll is based on the actual work being fully devoted to the bond program. Based on the conversations with employees, and review of timesheets and other documents, employees funded by the bond funds have exclusive responsibilities related to bond fund or a majority of works involved bond-related activities. Furthermore, from an accounting perspective, the payroll records are complete and accurate; the tested salary expenses are traceable to the specific employee who is being paid.

Improvement Recommendation: Applicable to employees who work partly in support of non-bond projects (two for fiscal year 2023), we recommend management to formally document the basis for distributing salary between the narrow category of bond compliant construction projects, and routine everyday school facilities administrator expenses. The California School Accounting Manual *Procedure 905* addresses distribution of salaries between restricted funding sources. The District's existing "Time & Effort Certification Policies and Procedures" may be applied to the bond program.

Specific Outcome No.1 – Adherence to Design and Construction Cost Budgets

Observation 1.1

The Facilities Master Plan was completed in 2020 and should be updated to remain relevant and valuable. The Facilities Master Plan (FMP) is a guiding document that prioritizes facilities projects across the district. For the FMP to be a helpful document, it must reflect current assumptions, the District's needs, and its demographics. The latest FMP was prepared as of April 2020. Board Policy (BP 7110) mandates the District to update the FMP “every five years in its entirety and also updated annually as to work accomplished in the prior year as well as the District’s demographics.”

Improvement Recommendation: The District should update the FMP per the frequency required by the Board Policy. If the alternative budget monitor reports are sufficient for the intermediate years, consider amending the Board Policy.

Observation 1.2

Immaterial inconsistencies between the spending plan referred to in the CBOC report and the latest budget were noted. We compared the budget changes between the Spending Plans (January 2021 for Measures B and J and June 2023 for Measure Y) and the budget reported to the CBOC as of June 30, 2023 for fifteen projects with significant current year expenditures. Seven out of fifteen projects selected indicated budget increase since the most recent spending plan. Those seven projects are as follows: East Oakland Pride Fire & Intrusion Alarm, Martin Luther King Fire & Intrusion Alarm, Oakland Int'l HS Intrusion Alarm, Claremont MS Cafeteria/MPR, Westlake MS Intrusion Alarm, Facilities & Shops Fire & Intrusion Alarm, and Fremont HS New Construction. Two projects, East Oakland Pride Fire & Intrusion Alarm and Martin Luther King Fire & Intrusion Alarm, did not have designated budgets per the January 2021 Spending Plan, but CBOC report presents total aggregated budget of \$2.9 million. One project, Castlemont Field/Bleacher, indicates total budget of \$11.1 million per the June 30 CBOC report, an increase of \$5.1 million in Measure Y from the total budget of \$6.0 million on the June 2023 Spending Plan. This project did not have a designated Measure Y budget per June 2023 Spending Plan.

We acknowledge the Spending Plans work as a guideline to set the project budget and the actual project budgets can be fluid as the project progresses; however, the CBOC report refers the current budget as the budget approved per January 2021 and June 2023 Spending Plans, which do not agree with the actual amount presented. The inconsistent reference in the CBOC report creates confusion to the reader and increases the risk of potential misrepresentation of the latest project budget.

Improvement Recommendation: A policy allowing for interim updates to the annual spending plan may resolve the inconsistency between these two reports. In addition, the District should consider updating the reference in the CBOC report and present the budget changes since the latest January 2021 and June 2023 Spending Plans do not accurately reflect the latest budget and the source of the information.

Specific Outcome No.2 – Adherence to Design and Construction Schedules and Timelines

Observation 2.1

The District has continued improving the completeness and accuracy of the reports presented to the CBOC. Based on the review of the CBOC meeting minutes and the related reports throughout fiscal year 2023 and the subsequent period, the District has continued taking steps to provide meaningful reports, which includes the project status, timeline, budget, and expenditures. Per review of December 11, 2023, CBOC meeting minutes, the District presented September 2023 Budget & Expenditures report, which lists all projects by sites, projects numbers, initial budget, budget changes, current budget, prior expenditures reported to CBOC, current expenditures, total accumulated expenditures, remaining/available budget amounts, total percentage of expenditures to the budget, and the project status. The District also continued to present the total resources against the total expenditures as of June 30, 2023, the remaining fund balance. The District also updates the project reconciliation report for the major projects requested by the CBOC. The project reconciliation report provides not only the contracted balance per object of the expenditures, it also provides budget, total expended, remaining to the committed balance, variance to the committed balance and total contingency outstanding. Although the above-mentioned reports do not direct address the timeline of the project, the District continues to present a separate report called the “Project Fact Sheet” monthly for the major projects identified by the CBOC. The September 2023 Fact Sheets included nine projects. Each Fact Sheet includes project description, current activities, project schedules, current budget, and the funding source. The project schedules include the important timeline such as contractor’s approval date, start of construction and anticipated project completion date. The District has updated the Project Fact Sheet to include the project scope, costs, schedule, funding, relevant change orders percentage change, and updated budgets as recommended per Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) Capital Project Monitoring and Reporting best practices.

Improvement Recommendation: The District should periodically consider if updates to the project fact sheet template are necessary for them to remain as useful as possible. The District may further collectively present an overall bond performance fact sheet. The District may include specific change orders with amounts and descriptions as well as include the specific budget changes with amounts and description for the change showing which fund the change is related to.

Observation 2.2

We identified reconcilable differences between various reported intended for key stakeholders. Based on our review of the “cumulative expenditures” as of June 30 per CBOC Report and the “total expenditures to date” as of the June 30 Project Budget Reconciliation, we noted the following differences: For Project # 13158, total expenditures to date per CBOC are \$113,670,746. Total expenditures to date per project recon are \$113,684,931. The difference of \$14,185 is due to ACC Environmental company invoices # 35671 for \$6,200 and invoice # 37037 for \$7,985 accidentally being paid for by a different project. This causes a \$14,185 understatement in the CBOC Report compared to the project recon. For project # 13128, total expenditures to date per CBOC are \$29,444,701. Total expenditures to date per project recon are \$29,377,676. \$67,025 difference is due to the project being started with project # 12100 under Measure B. \$67,025 was spent for initial assessment during this time. Once Measure J was passed, the project re-started with the new project #13128. Subsequent expenditures were charged to Measure J. For project # 15110, total expenditures to date per CBOC are \$1,272,637. Total expenditures to date per project recon are \$1,193,858. \$78,779 difference is due to the project starting when the site name was still Webster. \$78,779 was spent during this time. The sites name was then changed to East Oakland Pride. Subsequent expenditures have been recorded under the new name but same project number.

Improvement Recommendation: Although we do not believe the differences found materially impact readers of the reports, when differences are identified, reports should be updated to reflect the most complete and accurate information possible.

Specific Outcome No.3 – Financial Reporting and Internal Controls

Observation 3

Based on the review of the *OUSD Facilities Department Standard Operating Procedures Manual* the Staff Accountant works with project managers to review and reconcile financial information that is presented to the CBOC. We evaluated whether the information presented to the Citizens’ Bond Oversight Committee reconcile to the District’s accounting records by comparing total project expenditures for fiscal year 2023 reported on CBOC report and the district’s general ledger records. For this analysis, we selected the 15 projects identified in the table below. We noted all expenditures reported on the CBOC report reconciled without exception to the District’s accounting records.

Project Name	Project #	Per CBOC Report	Expenditures per general ledger	Difference
Laurel CDC Site Renovation	17126	\$ 8,090,977	\$ 8,090,977	-
Roosevelt Site Renovation	19101	1,878,453	1,878,453	-
East Oakland Pride Fire & Intrusion Alarm	15110	697,319	697,319	-
Martin Luther King Fire & Intrusion Alarm	15111	620,075	620,075	-
Oakland Int'l HS Intrusion Alarm	21103	358,013	358,013	-
Claremont MS Cafeteria/MPR	15127	10,276,036	10,276,036	-
Westlake MS Intrusion Alarm	21102	1,452,433	1,452,433	-
Facilities & Shops Fire & Intrusion Alarm	21106	67,466	67,466	-
Cole Central Administration	19119	15,236,129	15,236,129	-
Fremont HS New Construction	13158	745,825	745,825	-
Castlemont Field/Bleacher	17115	9,012,754	9,012,754	-
Madison MS Expansion	13124	305,266	305,266	-
East Oakland Pride Play matting & Play structure	17117	632,991	632,991	-
Madison Park Academy Primary Play matting	22121	322,172	322,172	-
Various Sites CSI California Solar Initiative	13128	201,262	201,262	-

We also evaluated the actions taken by bond program management to apply policies and procedures that accomplish the Bond Program schedule, scope management, and performance goals. We reviewed Bond Program reporting as needed to provide current, accurate, and complete cost, schedule, and budgetary information to Program stakeholders. Based on interviews and information gathered during the project audit, we conducted an analysis of financial reporting and controls. This analysis also reviewed the cost, schedule, and budgetary reporting and review methodologies.

Specific Outcome No.4 – Payment Processing

Observation 4

Expenditures were made for authorized projects and show evidence of compliance with the District’s internal controls, with the following clarification. We reviewed expenses for compliance with the Bond's requirements for Listed Projects to ensure that management allocated only allowable costs to the Bond Program. We reviewed 23 transactions covering \$3.5 million from Measure B, 67 transactions covering \$5.1 million from Measure J, and 85 transactions covering \$28.7 million from Measure Y. Of the 175 sampled expenditures, one consultant related transaction charged to Measure J did not include a Consultant Signature or a Consultant Status Report. Absence of a consistent application of approval procedures and documentation renders it challenging for us to ascertain compliance over Proposition 39. We also noted that the bond program funded “interim housing” of the 1000 Broadway administrative office for a portion of the fiscal year. The former administration building is not usable due to flooding that occurred during the fiscal year 2013. While the expenditure provides benefits to the District, the Bond language for Measure J does not explicitly address the 1000 Broadway District administration office lease, and also does not expressly define "interim." As of June 30, 2023, the 1000 Broadway lease has terminated, and the District has since vacated the space with plans to relocate to the Cole Administration building during the fiscal year 2024. Appendix D provides the detail of reviewed transactions.

Improvement Recommendation: Although we do not believe the missing signatures identified through the audit materially increases overall risk to the bond program, the District should continue monitoring its internal controls for relevancy and effectiveness. When differences are identified, the control should require that all signatures are secured prior to payment.

Specific Outcome No.5 – Change Order and Claim Procedures

Observation 5.1

Reviewed change orders/contract amendments were approved in accordance with the *District’s Procedures Manual*, with the following clarification. The District published the updated *OUSD Facilities Department Standard Operating Procedures Manual* (Procedures Manual) on the District website available for all stakeholders. We reviewed the District’s change order policy and procedures and considered whether the policy and procedures have appropriate controls over Public Contracting Code compliance and review and approval before issuing vendor payments.

**Oakland Unified School District
2006 Measure B, 2012 Measure J, and 2020 Measure Y Funds**

**Audit Results
June 30, 2023**

Additionally, we interviewed project managers and reviewed 12 amendments and change order files approved during the fiscal year 2023 to verify implementation of the Procedures Manual. All amendments and change orders reviewed indicated compliance with PCC 20118.4 and the District's Procedures Manual. The interviews with the projects managers provided consistent response that the District has the due-diligence process that requires the internal cost estimator to review the change order for any significant amount. The Procedures Manual also notes that "the District's estimator develops estimates for PCOs in excess of a \$5,000." However, applicable to seven of the eight construction related approved change orders that we reviewed, there was no documentation provided to us to indicating this procedure was performed. See Appendix C for the list of amendments and change orders reviewed.

Improvement Recommendations: The District should continue monitoring and updating policies around change order approval so they remain relevant and effective and to demonstrate the due-diligence procedures the District performs.

Observation 5.2

The District has improved its reporting of significant change orders and knowledge of possible future change orders. The District presents periodic updates to the CBOC through project “fact sheets” accompanied by a presentation. The fact sheet include estimated project schedules and financial details, including itemized cost/schedule changes from the prior report. Although decision-makers may have information on the status and responsible party about meaningful change orders, there is no defined policy for reporting meaningful change orders to key stakeholders.

We reviewed various project fact sheets, and during our interview with project managers, we reviewed the Construction Contract Status Report and observed the following information:

- Project Name
- Project Number
- Original Construction Contract Amount
- Approved Change Order Total
- Approved PCOs Not in Change Orders
- Estimated Costs Not in a PCO
- Final Contract Amount

Project fact sheets provide useful summary information, does not include change order impact or identification of the responsible party. Identifying change order responsibilities may include classifications such as owner-initiated, scope changes, design errors, contract errors, and unforeseen conditions.

Improvement Recommendation: The District should continue monitoring the process surrounding reported of meaningful change orders and so that it remains relevant and useful. As a best practice, the District should continue ensuring that end-users understand change order impact, assigned responsibility, and litigation exposure if any. The District may consider developing an active litigation report of claims filed. If there are none, there should be a standard report that says, "no litigation at this time." We further recommend establishing a threshold for reporting accepted change orders, which materially increase the use of resources, to key decision-makers. Such a limit could be exceeding the contingency reserve (Allowance Expenditure Directive) amount by a percentage or absolute amount but should be formally set up in policy so that it may be consistently followed.

Change order reporting should include itemized change amount, percentages, descriptions, change responsibility, and approval date. Within the bond program, change order documentation should be available at the project and program levels with detailed and summary information. Review and complete change reporting are necessary to understand change order cause, responsibility, pricing, and compliance and to identify potentially duplicated work scopes and redundancies caused by unclear scope objectives and expectations within the master plan. Policies and procedures surrounding change order management and controls should be updated to ensure consistent practices.

Specific Outcome No.6 – Bidding and Procurement Procedures

Observation 6.1

With specific exceptions and clarification, the District is following its established process over procurement/bidding. We reviewed fourteen bid documents to evaluate bid and procurement practices, procedures, and controls for applying competitive and fair general contracting and subcontracting practices. Our sample consisted of construction and consultant procurements. For each sample, our procedures considered the advertising, bids/proposals received, required forms, assurances, and finally approval by the District's Governing Board. Four of the fourteen contract documents we reviewed consisted of differences between the contractor's estimated price for the contract and the awarded amount with no specific reasons behind the difference provided. The Board Resolution #22-1992 contract with AGS, Inc. for Project #22126 had an estimated cost of \$154,669 with an actual awarded amount of \$151,690. The Board Resolution #22-2881 contract with Enviroplex, Inc. for Project #19101 had an estimated cost of \$262,667 with an actual awarded amount of \$941,905. The Board Resolution #23-0185 contract with Alten Construction, Inc. for Project #21110 had an estimated cost of \$4,174,936 with an actual awarded amount of \$5,724,000. The Board Resolution #23-0062 contract with Alas Technical Consultants, L.L.C. for Project #21118 had an estimated cost of \$27,231.60 with an actual awarded amount of \$24,446.40. Upon inquiry of the differences, we were informed that, in general each contractor takes into consideration factors like fluctuation in materials cost, labor requirements, delays, etc. when the final awarded amounts are awarded. There were no specific reasons behind the differences between the estimated cost and the awarded amount. See Appendix E, for the listing of procurement documents examined.

Improvement Recommendations: The District should continue monitoring the process surrounding procurement to ensure continual compliance and relevance. Specifically, with regards to the differences we identified between the contractor's estimated price for the contract and the awarded amount, District should track and document the specific reasons behind a decrease or increase.

Observation 6.2

With a specific exception, the District is following its established process for compliance with the Local Business Participation policy. One of the fourteen contract documents we reviewed (as stated in Observation 6.1) did not exceed the 50% Local Business Participation (LBP) percentage required by Board policy. The Board Resolution #22-2548 contract with DSK Architects for Project #22147 has an LBP percentage of 31%. We could not locate a waiver for the LBP percentage requirement. We were verbally informed by the District that the contract did not meet the 50% requirement due to the urgency and time sensitivity of the project.

Improvement Recommendations: The District should continue monitoring the process surrounding procurement to ensure continual compliance and relevance. The District should ensure the procurement file includes all applicable documentation, which is especially necessary for urgent or time sensitive procurements.

Specific Outcome No.7 – Best Practices for Procurement of Materials and Services

Observation 7

The District’s standardized items list for Bond Program materials procurement is not current and potentially incomplete. We determined whether OUSD had and used a standardized items list and educational specifications for Bond Program materials procurement to identify facilities material requirements. We reviewed the OUSD Hardware Specifications Guideline Booklet and Draft Materials Standards document. Upon review we noted the following dates of specification updates:

1. OUSD Hardware Specification Guideline Booklet – 12/2/2014.
2. OUSD Materials Standards Draft dated 8/11/2021 (2018 Version is available at the District website).
3. Facilities Master Plan – 2012 (Current material standard is based on the 2012 Facilities Master Plan, but the District has posted FMP 2020 online).
4. OUSD Design Guidelines – 6/30/2020 – Draft.
5. Educational Specifications Elementary School Level – 5/14/2014 – Draft.
6. Educational Specifications Middle School Level – 5/14/2014 – Draft.
7. Educational Specifications High School Level – 5/14/2014 – Draft.
8. Essential Outdoor Classroom Elements – May 2013.
9. Door Hardware Specification Guideline – 12/2/2014.
10. Hydraulic Elevator Standards – June 2019 - Draft.
11. OUSD Minimum Wheelchair Lift Standards – 6/30/2020 – Draft.
12. Fire Alarm Standards – March 2021 (Current material specification is based on 2013 and 2014 standards).
13. Intrusion Alarm System Standards – March 2021 (Current material specification is based on 2013 and 2014 standards).
14. Combination Fire Alarm and Intrusion Alarm System Standards – 12/13/2015.
15. OUSD Standard Network Build Specification – 6/30/2020 – Draft.
16. Technology Services Data & Communications Specifications – 2/24/2021 - Draft.

As noted in the updates above, at least seven categories of standardized specifications are still in draft, signifying they are not complete, reviewed, and approved as standard specification for use within the District. No evidence of formalized policies was available to document the procedures to update the material standards. The District’s newest Material Standards, dated 8/11/2021, utilizes at least four categories of an older version of specifications and guidelines.

From a facility's safety perspective, external regulations mandate compliance with building codes. There exist multiple layers of an independent review to verify compliance. Nonetheless, standardized specifications are to promote efficiency, energy conservation and consider the community's educational needs. Lack of standardization could also lead to increased owner-initiated changes orders, which can increase the project cost or time to completion. As of June 30, 2023, there have not been updates on the draft as mentioned above reports.

Improvement Recommendations: The District should regularly update its standardized items and educational specifications list to accurately reflect the most current standards and guidance local and state governments provide. The manual should include material types, standard equipment and systems, manufacturer specification numbers, and minimum standards for new construction and modernization mandated by the District for projects undertaken. This manual should be provided to project architects and designers, and required products and system specifications should be provided to all bidders during the procurement process. As a best practice, these minimum standards mandated by the District should consider facility safety, energy conservation (e.g., Title 21 and 24), longevity, educational requirements, and other appropriate regulations and standards. Procurement staff should be trained to utilize the standard specifications when procuring materials or services for the District.

Additionally, the District should define how to update the Standards Specifications document. This policy should ensure that documentation exists, including the requestor and date of request, description of the change, cost-benefit relationship for the change, approver, and date of approval, and a time-stamped updated specifications document (see Recommendations 8 and 9.1 for further information). The cost-benefit analysis for significant specification changes should be approved by appropriate OUSD management. The Standard Specifications document should avoid including narrow scope requirements to prevent excessive pricing to OUSD.

Specific Outcome No.8 and 9 – Conflict of Interest and Compliance with State Laws and Guidelines and Board Policy

Observations 8 and 9.1

The District did not provide a Conflict of Interest disclosure for all specific positions defined in the District’s board policy within facilities department. The District’s Conflict of Interest Code Board Policy (BP 10000), effective March 25, 2021, defines the designated officials, who are required to file Form 700 to comply with the amended Political Reform Act of 1974, which requires state and local government agencies to adopt and promulgate Conflict of Interest Codes. According to section 4 of the Standard Code, designated employees shall file Statements of Economic Interests (California Form 700) with the District, making the statements available for public inspection and reproduction (Gov. Code, § 81008). Based on the review of the board policy, we identified the following positions are required to file form 700 within the facilities department:

- Consultants
- Deputy Chief of Facilities, Planning & Management
- Executive Director of Facilities Planning and Management

We reviewed 69 conflict of interest forms covering District employees and outside consultants. We noted that five District employees as well as two outside consultants did not submit the require form. We were informed by the District that the specific people were not working for Facilities during the time the forms were submitted.

Improvement Recommendation: We recommend that conflict of interest forms are obtained annually, or upon “return to work” for employees or consultants who were not present at the time that the forms were initially required to be collected.

Observations 8 and 9.2

The District continues making progress on implementing the prior year's bond performance audit recommendations and following the published OUSD Facilities Department Standard Operating Procedures manuals. Key controls such as procedures to ensure compliance with Proposition 39 requirements, collection of time documentation for all bond-funded employees, and procedures and document control for stakeholder reporting should be continually monitored to remain relevant and efficient. Our analysis considered the laws, policies, and regulations the District is subject to.

As of June 30, 2023, the District continued to have two separate procedures manuals: *OUSD Procedures Manual*, finalized on September 2020, and *OUSD Facilities Department Standard Operating Procedures Manual*, published online. Although these two manuals complement each other, having two separate procedures manual increases the risk of inconsistent and confusing practices.

Improvement Recommendation: The district should continuously monitor and update the procedures manual to ensure the District policy and procedures reflect current requirements under State laws and regulations. The GFOA recommends, within their article "Documenting Accounting Policies and Procedures," that the documentation of accounting policies and procedures should be evaluated annually and updated periodically no less than once every three years. Any changes in policies and procedures should be updated in the documentation promptly as they occur, and a specific employee should be assigned the duty of overseeing this process. We recommend that construction program procedures be documented, updated, and promptly approved. The resulting documentation can also serve as a useful training tool for staff.

Conduct A Performance Audit (CAPA)

CAPA No. 1 – For split-funded employees, the District does not have a documented basis for distributing salary between the narrow category of bond compliant construction projects, and routine everyday school facilities administrator expenses.

We agree that there is not a formal basis of allocation, but the 80 percent allocation for two specific employees is reasonable based on anecdotal evidence. To address this finding, the District will develop a time documentation for record keeping per the California School Accounting Manual (CSAM) Procedures 905.

The District has already developed a Time and Effort Certification Procedure. The procedure has been discussed with the immediate past Deputy Chief. The procedure is provided here and has been implemented in alignment to the previously noted CSAM Procedure 905.

Specific Outcome No. 1 – Adherence to Design and Construction Cost Budgets

Observation 1.1 As of March, 2024 we began the process of updating the FMP.

Observation 1.2 The District has reviewed its cycle of updates between the spending plan, CBOC, Facilities Committee, and Board and will develop a more robust recommendation and adopt practices to remain consistent in updates to budget modifications and adoption/approval. The fluidity of the discussions and the steps taken to ensure that the discussion and workflow between the three bodies has improved communication where recommendations and alignment, which is not the same as agreement by all bodies, has improved the District's communication and progress with design and budget discussions.

Specific Outcome No. 2 – Adherence to Design and Construction Schedules and Timelines

Observation 2.1 The District continues to develop a master schedule for each project in Measure Y, Measure J, Measure B to be completed, and uses "Colbi-Doc (i.e. program management software)" to track each project budget, pending and approved change orders, and planned expenditures by fiscal year. Additionally, the District also continues to develop a project status report that provides the projects scope, schedule, and budget that will be posted on the Facilities Department website.

Observation 2.2 Although the differences identified likely would not impact the decisions of those who the reports are intended to benefit, we will review our processes to ensure full accuracy. Where necessary we will consider if revisions to the template make sense for instances when, for example, the project's name is changed although the underlying project is unchanged. The District continues to work on process improvement and its practices.

Specific Outcome No.3 – Financial Reporting and Internal Controls

Observation 3 The District has demonstrated a continual improvement in this area.

Specific Outcome No. 4 – Payment Processing

Observation 4 We have reminded personnel that all signatures are required by District policy in all instances.

Specific Outcome No. 5 – Change Order and Claim Procedures

Observation 5.1 We appreciate the recommendations for improvement and want to point out that all change orders are reviewed by the general counsel’s office or their designee before presentation to Board for approval. As of February 9, 2022 the District has updated its procedures manual to address the change order process to ensure consistency and compliance with GFOA standard practices.

Observation 5.2 We are continually monitoring the process surrounding reports of meaningful change orders and so that it remains relevant and useful. We consider best practices, availability of resources, and the requests of our key stakeholders and community.

Specific Outcome No. 6 – Bidding and Procurement Procedures

Observations 6.1 and 6.2 We are continually monitoring the process surrounding procurement. Our goal is to ensure that 100% of procurement are accompanied by a complete procurement file. We are evaluating any deficiencies short of that goal for improvement.

Specific Outcome No. 7 – Best Practices for Procurement of Materials and Services

Observation 7 The Department has updated the design standards for materials and equipment in collaboration with Buildings & Grounds as of August 2021, and will work to update the education specifications. The District has hired a Director of Planning whose scope of work includes the update of the design standards and the education specifications.

Specific Outcome Nos. 8 and 9 – Conflict of Interest and Compliance with State Laws and Guidelines and Board Policy

Observation 8 & 9.1 We have revised our policy to obtain the conflict of interest form upon “return to work” for employees or consultants who were not present at the time that the forms were initially required to be collected.

Observation 8 & 9.2 We are continually reviewing our processes and looking for ways to improve.

**Oakland Unified School District
2006 Measure B, 2012 Measure J, and 2020 Measure Y Funds**

**Appendix A – Interviews Performed
June 30, 2023**

Name	Position	Date Interviewed
Kenya Chatman	Executive Director of Facilities	Throughout the audit
David Colbert	Acting Director of Facilities Planning & Management	Throughout the audit
Michael Ezeh	Accounting Program Manager	Throughout the audit
Juanita Hunter	Contracts & Bids Specialist	Throughout the audit
Sandra Soo	Facilities Accountant II	Throughout the audit
Penti III, Tarpeh	Facilities Accountant II	Throughout the audit
Mary Ledezma	Project Manager	12/11/2023
William Newby	Project Manager	12/11/2023
Chastity Henderson	Project Engineer	12/11/2023
John Esposito	Project Manager	12/11/2023
Elena Comrie	Project Manager	12/13/2023
JaQuan Cornish	Project Manager	12/14/2023
Mike Torres	Project Manager	12/14/2023
Nicole Wells	Project Manager	12/14/2023
Paul Orr	Project Manager	12/22/2023
Christine Stone	Project Engineer	12/22/2023

**Oakland Unified School District
2006 Measure B, 2012 Measure J, and 2020 Measure Y Funds**

**Appendix B – Review of Prior Year Audit
June 30, 2023**

The following table shows the current year status of each prior year performance audit observation.

Source	Prior Year Observation	Prior Year Recommendation	Current Year Status
CAPA 1	The ballot language addresses projects at the District and school site levels; however, particular expenditures are not explicit the Bond language.	District should consider for future ballot languages.	Resolved
CAPA 2	For split-funded employees, the District does not have a documented basis for distributing salary between the narrow category of bond compliant construction projects, and routine everyday school facilities administrator expenses.	Our recommendation is for the District to implement the policy about documenting time for Federally funded programs.	See current year CAPA No. 1
CAPA 3	Although no instance of noncompliance was noted, there is an opportunity to strengthen internal controls over the approval procedure for certain interdepartmental transactions.	Although departments other than Facilities may legitimately expend bond funds on eligible activities, we recommend that Facilities personal remain involved in the approval process. The reason is to mitigate the risk of approving unallowable activities due to decentralized approval processes. The Facilities personnel have the historical experience to assess allowability, to ensure all expenditures are recorded into the bond fund accounting and budget records, to ensure proper reporting of all payments to key stakeholders, and because the Facilities department is ultimately responsible for compliance.	See CY Observation 5.1
CAPA 4	Although no instance of noncompliance was noted, there is an opportunity to strengthen internal controls over the approval procedure during the year-end financial closing process.	During the year-end financial closing process, we recommend the Facilities and the District’s fiscal department to apply the same approval and review procedures over accrued expenditures, to ensure all expenditures recorded into the bond funds are allowable per voter approved ballot language for each measure as well as to ensure the invoice approval and documentation procedures over all bond related expenditures are consistently applied.	See CY Observation 5.1

**Oakland Unified School District
2006 Measure B, 2012 Measure J, and 2020 Measure Y Funds**

**Appendix B – Review of Prior Year Audit (Continued)
June 30, 2023**

Source	Prior Year Observation	Prior Year Recommendation	Current Year Status
Observation 1.1	Although none in the current year, the District’s project cancellation increases the risk of inefficient use of bond funds.	Project cancellation leads to inefficient use of bond funds. A policy allowing for interim updates to the annual spending plan may mitigate future similar projects' risk. In addition, the District should report the project schedule and planned expenditures by project and by funding source to ensure enough funds are available to complete a project.	Resolved
Observation 1.2	Although the budget presented to the CBOC is based on the latest project budgets, there is an inconsistency between the spending plan referred to in the CBOC report and the latest budget.	A policy allowing for interim updates to the annual spending plan may resolve the inconsistency between these two reports. In addition, the District should consider updating the reference in the CBOC report and presents the budget changes since the latest January 2021 Spending Plan to accurately reflect the latest budget and the source of the information.	See CY Observation 1
Observation 2	The District has taken major step toward resolving the prior year Observation 2 by improving the reports presented to the CBOC in more comprehensive format.	The District should finalize the updated project fact sheet and the financial reports presented to the CBOC. The District should consolidate Measure Y financial information to the current Measure B and J report to collectively present overall bond performance.	See CY Observation 2.1
Observation 4	The District’s payment procedures were consistently applied throughout the fiscal year with minor administrative errors.	N/A	Resolved
Observation 5.1	The District’s change order documentation should reflect the actual procedures performed by the District.	District should review and update the manual to provide consistent procedures throughout the manual.	See CY Observation 5.1
Observation 5.2	There is no defined policy for reporting meaningful change orders to key stakeholders.	N/A	See CY Observation 5.2

**Oakland Unified School District
2006 Measure B, 2012 Measure J, and 2020 Measure Y Funds**

**Appendix B – Review of Prior Year Audit (Continued)
June 30, 2023**

Source	Prior Year Observation	Prior Year Recommendation	Current Year Status
Observation 6.1	Bid documents - In few instances, the District could not provide documentation, such as score sheet, that we could review to conclude if the lowest cost or best value vendors were selected for four public works projects.	The District should update the policies and procedures to ensure the maintenance of bid and procurement documentation that is readily available in a central location, either physically or electronically. This will enable the District to verify compliance with applicable guidance and support the performance audit. Additionally, as a best practice, the District should maintain a consolidated bid and procurement activity report that will allow District senior management to identify, prevent, or detect noncompliance with District policies and procedures, state laws and regulations, and best practices (e.g., not sole source procurement). A checklist or equivalent mechanism, with appropriate sign-offs on procurement requirements, can serve as a useful tool for all relevant parties (Accounting, as well as Facilities and Procurement) to validate compliance with policy and procedure requirements.	Resolved
Observation 6.2	The errors and inconsistencies in the contractual documentation amplifies the potential for inadvertent legal liabilities regarding payment obligations.	The District should designate an individual to be responsible for reviewing the completeness of the contract documentations including the awarded board memo.	Resolved

**Oakland Unified School District
2006 Measure B, 2012 Measure J, and 2020 Measure Y Funds**

**Appendix B – Review of Prior Year Audit (Continued)
June 30, 2023**

Source	Prior Year Observation	Prior Year Recommendation	Current Year Status
Observation 7	The District’s standardized items list for Bond Program materials procurement is not current and potentially incomplete.	<p>The District should regularly update its standardized items and educational specifications list to accurately reflect the most current standards and guidance local and state governments provide. The manual should include material types, standard equipment and systems, manufacturer specification numbers, and minimum standards for new construction and modernization mandated by the District for projects undertaken. This manual should be provided to project architects and designers, and required products and system specifications should be provided to all bidders during the procurement process. As a best practice, these minimum standards mandated by the District should consider facility safety, energy conservation (e.g., Title 21 and 24), longevity, educational requirements, and other appropriate regulations and standards. Procurement staff should be trained to utilize the standard specifications when procuring materials or services for the District.</p> <p>Additionally, the District should define how to update the Standards Specifications document. This policy should ensure that documentation exists, including the requestor and date of request, description of the change, cost-benefit relationship for the change, approver, and date of approval, and a time-stamped updated specifications document (see Recommendations 8 and 9.2 for further information). The cost-benefit analysis for significant specification changes should be approved by appropriate OUSD management. The Standard Specifications document should avoid including narrow scope requirements to prevent excessive pricing to OUSD.</p>	See CY Observation 7

Oakland Unified School District
2006 Measure B, 2012 Measure J, and 2020 Measure Y Funds

Appendix B – Review of Prior Year Audit (Continued)
June 30, 2023

Source	Prior Year Observation	Prior Year Recommendation	Current Year Status
Observation 8 and 9.2	Policies and procedures were updated, centrally located, defined roles and responsibilities, and readily available on the District’s website; however, some procedures are inconsistent and incomplete as of June 30, 2022.	Best practice reminder to continually update.	See CY Observation 8 and 9

**Oakland Unified School District
2006 Measure B, 2012 Measure J, and 2020 Measure Y Funds**

**Appendix C – Observation 5.2
June 30, 2023**

The following table contains the list of change order reviewed. See Observation 5.1 for additional details

Project Name	Project #	Vendor Name	CO/Amendment #	Reviewed by Internal Cost Estimator	Approved by Legal	Approved by Deputy Chief	Approved by Board?	Complied with PCC 20118.4?
Claremont Middle School New Multi-Purpose Building Project	15127	S Meek Architecture	Amendment No. 3	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Glenview Elementary School New Construction Project	13134	HKIT Architects	Amendment No. 1	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Acorn Woodland Elementary School/Lockwood STEAM Academy & New Highland Academy Project - additional "Group 2" per the RFP process, including Martin Luther King, Jr. Elementary School, The Center at Foster Elementary School, Hoover Elementary School, and Frick United Academy of Language Solar Initiative Various Sites Project	21118	KDI Group, Inc.	Amendment No. 1	Undetermined	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Castlemont High School Field & Bleachers Project	17115	Sandis Civil Engineers Surveyors Planners	Amendment No. 1	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Facilities Planning and Management Project	918	Lowе Consulting Group, Inc.	Amendment No. 4	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Special Education Department Exterior Painting Project	70012	Bay Construction Company	Change Order No. 1	Undetermined	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Castlemont High School Field and Bleachers Replacement Project	17115	CWS Construction Group, Inc.	Change Order No. 1	Undetermined	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cole Campus Central Administration Center Project	19119	Arntz Builders, Inc.	Change Order No. 2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Oakland International High School and Oakland Technical High School Security Improvement Project	22133	DecoTech Systems	Change Order No. 1	Undetermined	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Burckhalter Elementary School Site Improvements Project	22123	District and G & G Builders, Inc.	Change Order No. 1	Undetermined	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Castlemont High School Field and Bleachers Replacement Project	17115	CWS Construction Group, Inc.	Change Order No. 2	Undetermined	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Oakland High School Security Improvements Project	22135	DecoTech Systems	Change Order No. 2	Undetermined	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

**Oakland Unified School District
2006 Measure B, 2012 Measure J, and 2020 Measure Y Funds**

**Appendix D – List of Expenditures Reviewed
June 30, 2023**

The following table lists expenditures selected and tested for compliance and assessed for internal control.

PO #	Vendor Name	Warrant #	Date	Amount
Measure B				
PO23-02396	COLLINS ELECTRICAL COMPANY INC	51586233	01/04/2023	\$ 1,208,477
PO23-03261	CWS CONSTRUCTION GROUP, INC	51610913	06/30/2023	682,671
PO23-03261	CWS CONSTRUCTION GROUP, INC	51620521	06/30/2023	288,183
PO23-10078	MARCON CO	51706454	06/30/2023	214,457
PO23-02127	BAY CONSTRUCTION COMPANY	51586199	01/06/2023	152,764
PO23-02685	BAY CONSTRUCTION COMPANY	51633058	05/19/2023	148,474
PO23-02127	BAY CONSTRUCTION COMPANY	51606125	03/03/2023	112,306
PO23-02127	BAY CONSTRUCTION COMPANY	51591586	01/20/2023	107,490
PO23-02127	BAY CONSTRUCTION COMPANY	51556921	09/27/2022	100,251
PO23-01867	G & G BUILDERS	51553963	09/16/2022	89,417
PO23-02685	BAY CONSTRUCTION COMPANY	51560646	10/07/2022	88,620
PO23-02685	BAY CONSTRUCTION COMPANY	51601932	02/21/2023	87,016
PO23-02685	BAY CONSTRUCTION COMPANY	51615712	03/28/2023	75,847
PO23-02127	BAY CONSTRUCTION COMPANY	51620463	04/14/2023	67,894
PO23-10038	CAL STAR SYSTEMS SUPPLY, LLC	51706197	06/30/2023	26,222
PO23-09786	DIALOG DESIGN LP	51633161	05/19/2023	19,759
PO23-10341	DECOTECH SYSTEMS	51708689	06/30/2023	17,273
PO23-04940	ACC ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS	51620423	04/14/2023	9,546
PO23-01422	KING CONSTRUCTION INSPECTIONS	51629010	05/08/2023	9,390
PO23-01710	JENSEN HUGHES	51628999	05/08/2023	8,920
PO23-02919	ELITE SECURITY SERVICES	51584220	12/19/2022	2,940
PO23-07222	SMALL BUSINESS EXCHANGE	51611232	03/17/2023	468
PO23-07239	EAST BAY BLUE PRINT AND SUPPLY	51610944	03/17/2023	35

**Oakland Unified School District
2006 Measure B, 2012 Measure J, and 2020 Measure Y Funds**

**Appendix D – List of Expenditures Reviewed (Continued)
June 30, 2023**

PO #	Vendor Name	Warrant #	Date	Amount
Measure J				
PO23-03261	CWS CONSTRUCTION GROUP, INC.	51610913	03/17/2023	1,405,901
PO23-03261	CWS CONSTRUCTION GROUP, INC.	51694622	06/02/2023	1,151,265
PO23-01867	G & G BUILDERS	51553963	09/16/2022	433,844
PO23-04856	APPLE	51615693	03/28/2023	316,352
PO23-03261	CWS CONSTRUCTION GROUP, INC.	51694622	06/02/2023	281,677
PO23-01711	REDGWICK CONSTRUCTION	51565080	10/21/2022	182,136
PO22-00324	SPARKNIGHT LLC c/o CBRE-ASSET SERVICE DEPT.	51540473	07/22/2022	125,149
PO23-02312	GROUP H CONSTRUCTION INC.	51560719	10/07/2022	102,546
PO23-04856	APPLE	51615693	03/28/2023	99,122
PO23-02311	DECOTECH SYSTEMS	51699749	06/16/2023	99,037
PO23-01179	MURAKAMI AND NELSON ARCHITECTURAL	51591843	01/20/2023	69,694
PO23-01504	DIVISION OF STATE ARCHITECTS	51550285	09/02/2022	65,054
PO23-00754	MULTISTUDIO	51557085	09/27/2022	60,483
PO23-02258	ROOK ELECTRIC	51586567	01/06/2023	57,385
PO23-04386	SOF SURFACES,	51584439	12/19/2022	56,893
PO23-02743	DATA MEDIA SERVICES	51577609	12/02/2022	48,735
PO23-09194	HARDISON KOMASTSU IVELICH & TUCKER	51625078	04/25/2023	47,023
PO23-04856	APPLE	51615693	03/28/2023	34,379
PO23-08801	CDW-G	51694595	06/02/2023	33,320
PO23-03991	HIBSER YAMAUCHI ARCHITECT,	51703156	06/26/2023	32,845
PO23-02391	NINYO & MOORE	51591853	01/20/2023	32,765
PO23-10268	DUDE SOLUTIONS, INC.	51699762	06/16/2023	30,384
PO23-04933	KING CONSTRUCTION INSPECTIONS	51597114	02/03/2023	30,130
PO23-03260	APPLIED MATERIALS ENGINEERING, INC.	51591560	01/20/2023	24,750
PO23-01076	SHAH KAWASAKI ARCHITECTS,	51625291	04/25/2023	24,681
PO23-00751	KDI CONSULTANTS	51546356	08/19/2022	23,000
PO23-00375	INNOVATIVE CONSTRUCTION CO.	51560739	10/07/2022	19,100
PO23-05385	DATA MEDIA SERVICES	51597028	02/03/2023	16,769
PO23-09154	AREY JONES	51694534	06/02/2023	16,522
PO23-01972	DEPT OF TOXICS & SUBSTANCES CONTROL -	51610929	03/17/2023	14,001
PO23-09944	ANTHONIO, INC.	51706151	06/30/2023	12,320
PO23-02683	GUTTMANN & BLAEVOET	51611002	03/17/2023	12,215
PO23-05991	HERTZ ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.	51602088	02/21/2023	10,902
PO23-09502	BAY AREA COMMUNITY RESOURCES	51633054	05/19/2023	10,818
PO23-00387	SUNPOWER	51565116	10/21/2022	10,142
PO23-10083	PUBLIC ECONOMICS, INC.	51706553	06/30/2023	9,813
PO23-00378	SAFETIGHT SECURITY LLC	51550405	09/02/2022	9,584
PO23-00752	ENGEO INC.	51556976	09/27/2022	9,562
PO23-01706	NOR-CAL MOVING SERVICES	51550371	09/02/2022	9,150
PO23-10345	WESTERN ROOFING SERVICE	51703416	06/26/2023	8,348

**Oakland Unified School District
2006 Measure B, 2012 Measure J, and 2020 Measure Y Funds**

**Appendix D – List of Expenditures Reviewed (Continued)
June 30, 2023**

PO #	Vendor Name	Warrant #	Date	Amount
Measure J (Continued)				
PO23-02746	SCA ENVIRONMENTAL INC	51565087	10/21/2022	7,911.69
PO22-08922	MAYEKAWA USA	51574806	11/21/2022	7,805.00
PO23-04932	PROJECT SUPPORT SERVICES	51703295	06/26/2023	7,725.00
PO23-03990	ACC ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS	51606076	03/03/2023	7,100.00
PO23-07241	SYSKA HENNESSY GROUP, INC.	51611255	03/17/2023	6,500.00
PO23-04811	LCA ARCHITECTS,	51694733	06/02/2023	6,164.76
PO23-01288	MILLENNIUM CONSULTING ASSOC.	51550358	09/02/2022	5,555.45
PO23-02030	SANDIS CIVIL ENGINEERS	51694840	06/02/2023	3,922.53
PO23-03566	TERRAPHASE ENGINEERING,	51574957	11/21/2022	3,799.94
PO23-01288	MILLENNIUM CONSULTING ASSOC.	51565040	10/21/2022	3,641.50
PO23-02916	SAFE 2 PLAY/CRAIG FAITEL	51565084	10/21/2022	3,025.00
PO23-02745	KW ENGINEERING	51629014	05/08/2023	2,513.25
PO23-01181	ARBITRAGE COMPLIANCE SPECIALISTS, INC.	51591562	01/20/2023	2,500.00
PO23-02745	KW ENGINEERING	51569606	11/04/2022	2,193.75
PO23-01420	CONSOLIDATED ENGINEERING LABORATORIES,	51706324	06/30/2023	1,920.52
PO23-02315	LAMPHIER-GREGORY	51560753	10/07/2022	1,794.99
PO23-02920	B SAFE PLAYGROUND INSPECTION SERVICES	51564907	10/21/2022	1,450.00
PO23-03565	JENSEN HUGHES	51574744	11/21/2022	1,170.00
N/A	GROUND PENETRATING RADAR	51546337	08/19/2022	1,100.00
PO23-05383	DAILY JOURNAL CORPORATION	51597027	02/03/2023	1,057.65
PO23-01526	TOSHIBA BUSINESS SOLUTIONS	51703388	06/26/2023	637.97
PO23-01175	DAILY JOURNAL CORPORATION	51546303	08/19/2022	637.79
PO23-01288	MILLENNIUM CONSULTING ASSOC.	51550358	09/02/2022	595.00
N/A	SMALL BUSINESS EXCHANGE	51550412	09/02/2022	468.00
PO23-00982	XEBEC DATA CORP.	51700028	06/16/2023	404.03
PO23-00379	EAST BAY BLUE PRINT AND SUPPLY	51633176	05/19/2023	375.09
PO23-09951	ARC DOCUMENT DBA ARC IMAGING RESOURCES	51633034	05/19/2023	280.04

**Oakland Unified School District
2006 Measure B, 2012 Measure J, and 2020 Measure Y Funds**

**Appendix D – List of Expenditures Reviewed (Continued)
June 30, 2023**

PO #	Vendor Name	Warrant #	Date	Amount
Measure Y				
PO23-00757	ARNTZ BUILDERS,	51546267	08/19/2022	2,164,976
PO23-03261	CWS CONSTRUCTION GROUP, INC.	51586556	01/06/2023	1,841,409
PO23-02536	ARNTZ BUILDERS,	51564897	10/21/2022	1,756,737
PO23-00759	ARNTZ BUILDERS,	51584129	12/19/2022	1,681,274
PO23-02536	ARNTZ BUILDERS,	51584132	12/19/2022	1,313,358
PO23-02536	ARNTZ BUILDERS,	51694536	06/02/2023	1,071,307
PO23-00759	ARNTZ BUILDERS,	51710545	06/30/2023	1,069,887
PO23-03261	CWS CONSTRUCTION GROUP, INC.	51574644	11/21/2022	1,068,889
PO23-02536	ARNTZ BUILDERS,	51628833	05/08/2023	1,067,619
PO23-02536	ARNTZ BUILDERS,	51560624	10/07/2022	1,015,544
PO23-00759	ARNTZ BUILDERS,	51700281	06/16/2023	1,014,263
PO23-03261	CWS CONSTRUCTION GROUP, INC.	51569483	11/04/2022	998,749
PO23-02536	ARNTZ BUILDERS,	51710544	06/30/2023	994,770
PO23-00757	ARNTZ BUILDERS,	51708647	06/30/2023	948,306
PO23-00757	ARNTZ BUILDERS,	51591566	01/20/2023	937,352
PO23-00978	360 TOTAL CONCEPT,	51620413	04/14/2023	44,548
PO23-00757	ARNTZ BUILDERS,	51700280	06/16/2023	901,613
PO23-02536	ARNTZ BUILDERS,	51615696	03/28/2023	853,728
PO23-00757	ARNTZ BUILDERS,	51615697	03/28/2023	841,361
PO23-00759	ARNTZ BUILDERS,	51708648	06/30/2023	808,775
PO23-00759	ARNTZ BUILDERS,	51584130	12/19/2022	668,781
PO23-00759	ARNTZ BUILDERS,	51628834	05/08/2023	658,186
PO23-02246	WestAmerica Bank- Cole WAB1919	51579767	12/08/2022	441,858
PO23-10043	REDGWICK CONSTRUCTION	51710640	06/30/2023	433,739
PO23-01657	HARDISON KOMASTSU IVELICH & TUCKER	51699809	06/16/2023	334,757
PO23-10363	MARCON CO/ SYRBERUS 987246149	51706455	06/30/2023	268,560
PO23-01505	BRAILSFORD & DUNLAVEY,	51628880	05/08/2023	239,784
PO23-04926	DECOTECH SYSTEMS	51615757	03/28/2023	211,557
PO23-01505	BRAILSFORD & DUNLAVEY,	51556931	09/27/2022	192,545
PO23-01506	CUMMING CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT	51564955	10/21/2022	162,471
PO23-00756	SPARKNIGHT LLC c/o CBRE-ASSET SERVICE DEPT.	51625314	04/25/2023	142,052
PO23-01170	CORDOBA CORP	51699742	06/16/2023	137,348
PO23-02313	ACC ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS	51610768	03/17/2023	22,160
PO23-01180	AGS INC.	51606080	03/03/2023	121,352
PO23-03263	ALAMEDA COUNTY CLERK	51569368	11/04/2022	50
PO23-00976	ANTHONIO, INC.	51624878	04/25/2023	33,750
PO23-01289	ATLAS TECHNICAL CONSULTANTS	51550224	09/02/2022	4,237
PO23-00755	BAINES SECURITY CONSULTING	51564908	10/21/2022	6,771
PO23-10032	BAY AREA NEWS GROUP-EAST BAY	51694555	06/02/2023	716
PO23-00924	BUILDING MAPS	51591601	01/20/2023	37,339

**Oakland Unified School District
2006 Measure B, 2012 Measure J, and 2020 Measure Y Funds**

**Appendix D – List of Expenditures Reviewed (Continued)
June 30, 2023**

PO #	Vendor Name	Warrant #	Date	Amount
Measure Y (Continued)				
PO23-06095	CALIFORNIA GEOLOGICAL SURVEY	51601959	02/21/2023	3,600
PO23-07181	CDW-G	51628896	05/08/2023	4,315
PO23-06644	COLBI TECHNOLOGIES, INC.	51610896	03/17/2023	60,000
PO23-01172	CONSOLIDATED ENGINEERING LABORATORIES,	51606169	03/03/2023	28,326
PO23-02684	CONSTRUCTION TESTING SERVICES	51569476	11/04/2022	8,090
PO23-00389	DAILY JOURNAL CORPORATION	51706334	06/30/2023	2,724
PO23-02125	DEPT OF TOXICS & SUBSTANCES CONTROL -	51556965	09/27/2022	23,813
PO23-10036	DIVISION OF STATE ARCHITECTS	51694636	06/02/2023	50,240
PO23-03875	DSK, LLP	51620537	04/14/2023	57,540
PO23-05163	EAST BAY BLUE PRINT AND SUPPLY	51610944	03/17/2023	974
PO23-10325	EAST BAY MUNICIPAL UTILITY DIS	51703107	06/26/2023	121,794
PO23-00386	ELATION SYSTEMS, INC.	51540355	07/22/2022	40,556
PO23-04927	ENVIROPLEX, INC.	51708703	06/30/2023	24,707
PO23-04076	FAGEN FRIEDMAN & FULFROST LLP	51610968	03/17/2023	15,855
PO23-05908	FARALLON CONSULTING LLC	51620552	04/14/2023	9,390
PO23-00796	FED EX NATIONAL LTL	51546322	08/19/2022	102
PO23-01177	HERTZ ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.	51546341	08/19/2022	2,000
PO23-02031	HIBSER YAMAUCHI ARCHITECT,	51569563	11/04/2022	23,627
PO23-03009	IDA STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS INC.	51565008	10/21/2022	8,500
PO23-09195	JENSEN HUGHES, INC.	51625103	04/25/2023	686
PO23-04943	KDI CONSULTANTS	51694723	06/02/2023	3,667
PO23-05388	KING CONSTRUCTION INSPECTIONS	51611054	03/17/2023	21,290
PO23-03162	KITCHELL/CEM	51710612	06/30/2023	112,523
PO23-02686	KW ENGINEERING	51560751	10/07/2022	19,298
PO23-01169	LOWE CONSULTING GROUP INC.	51546364	08/19/2022	16,500
PO23-01774	LOZANO SMITH, LLP	51597134	02/03/2023	43,897
PO23-09482	M and I Towing and Transport	51633323	05/19/2023	940
PO23-00377	MICHELLE FIERSTON	51546369	08/19/2022	1,958
PO23-01424	NINYO & MOORE	51597156	02/03/2023	32,602
PO23-08791	NOR-CAL MOVING SERVICES	51620647	04/14/2023	7,500
PO23-04928	ORBACH HUFF & HENDERSON LLP	51606330	03/03/2023	1,740
PO23-01704	PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC	51550390	09/02/2022	2,500
PO23-01702	PERKINS EASTMAN ARCHITECTS DPC	51550394	09/02/2022	67,796
PO23-10030	ROOK ELECTRIC	51694833	06/02/2023	45,885
PO23-01178	S MEEK ARCHITECTURE	51565082	10/21/2022	55,441
PO23-04567	SAFE 2 PLAY/CRAIG FAITEL	51586411	01/06/2023	1,160
PO23-01176	SANDIS CIVIL ENGINEERS	51584414	12/19/2022	24,428
PO23-02006	SCHOOL FACILITY CONSULTANTS	51557146	09/27/2022	7,770
PO23-01421	SHAH KAWASAKI ARCHITECTS,	51550410	09/02/2022	64,147
PO23-02393	SIXTH DIMENSION PMCM INC.	51565103	10/21/2022	114,843

**Oakland Unified School District
2006 Measure B, 2012 Measure J, and 2020 Measure Y Funds**

**Appendix D – List of Expenditures Reviewed (Continued)
June 30, 2023**

PO #	Vendor Name	Warrant #	Date	Amount
Measure Y (Continued)				
PO23-01148	SMALL BUSINESS EXCHANGE	51546412	08/19/2022	468
PO23-00750	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD,	51546436	08/19/2022	5,185
PO23-01707	VALLEY RELOCATION AND STORAGE	51550438	09/02/2022	50,000
PO23-03307	VIATRON SYSTEMS, INC.	51592002	01/20/2023	57,296
N/A	ARNTZ BUILDERS,	51721217	06/30/2023	908,265

**Oakland Unified School District
2006 Measure B and 2012 Measure J Funds**

**Appendix E – List of Contracts and Procurement Documents Reviewed
June 30, 2023**

The following table consists the list of contracts and procurement documents reviewed.

Project Number	Project Site	Contractor Name	Contract Price
Measure J			
	Melrose Leadership Academy at Maxwell Park		
22126	Elementary School & Sherman Campus	HKIT Archtects	1,104,910
13158	Fremont High School	Hibser Yamauchi (HY) Architects, Inc	381,150
13158	Fremont High School	Apple Inc.	492,546
Measure Y			
		West Michigan Warehouse	
22125	VariousSchool Sites(Facilities)	Outfitters, Inc., dba Building Maps	258,143
22126	Melrose Leadership Academy	AGS, Inc.	151,690
22147	West Oakland Middle School	DSK Architects	598,000
19101	Roosevelt Middle School	Enviroplex, Inc.	941,905
21110	McClymonds High School	Alten Construction, Inc.	5,724,000
23104	Castlemont High School	DecoTech Systems, Inc.	323,000
22155	Community Day Campus	Mar Con Builders, Inc.	264,337
22120	Melrose Leadership Academy	Redgwick Construction Company	3,180,800
21112	Kaiser Child Development Center	Mar Con Builders, Inc.	6,551,440
19101	Roosevelt Middle School	Arntz Builders, Inc.	1,932,364
	Acorn Woodland Elementary School/Lockwood		
21118	STEAM Academy & New Highland Academy	Atlas Technical Consultants, L.L.C.	24,446