

GROSSMONT HEALTHCARE DISTRICT
AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES REPORT
ON CASH DISBURSEMENTS
MADE UNDER PROPOSITION G

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011

**GROSSMONT HEALTHCARE DISTRICT
AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES REPORT
ON CASH DISBURSEMENTS
MADE UNDER PROPOSITION G**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

June 30, 2011

	Page Number
Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures	1
Attachment I: Procedures & Findings	2-3



DIEHL, EVANS & COMPANY, LLP
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS & CONSULTANTS

A PARTNERSHIP INCLUDING ACCOUNTANCY CORPORATIONS

2965 ROOSEVELT STREET
CARLSBAD, CALIFORNIA 92008-2389
(760) 729-2343 • FAX (760) 729-2234
www.diehlevans.com

*PHILIP H. HOLTkamp, CPA
*THOMAS M. PERLOWSKI, CPA
*HARVEY J. SCHROEDER, CPA
KENNETH R. AMES, CPA
MICHAEL R. LUDIN, CPA
CRAIG W. SPRAKER, CPA
NITIN P. PATEL, CPA
ROBERT J. CALLANAN, CPA

* A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

August 25, 2011

**INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT
ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES**

Board of Directors
Grossmont Healthcare District
La Mesa, California

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, which were agreed to by Management and the Audit Committee of Grossmont Healthcare District and as requested by the Independent Community Bond Oversight Committee (the specified parties), solely to assist you with respect to the accounting records supporting Proposition G project costs expended during the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011 of Grossmont Healthcare District. Grossmont Healthcare District's management is responsible for the District's accounting records. This agreed-upon procedures engagement was conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. The sufficiency of these procedures is solely the responsibility of those parties specified in the report. Consequently, we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the procedures described below either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose.

Our procedures and findings are presented herein on pages 2 through 3.

We were not engaged to, and did not conduct an audit, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on the accounting records. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of Management and the Audit Committee of Grossmont Healthcare District and Proposition G Independent Community Bond Oversight Committee and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than those specified parties.

Diehl, Evans and Company, LLP

-1-

OTHER OFFICES AT:

613 W. VALLEY PARKWAY, SUITE 330
ESCONDIDO, CALIFORNIA 92025-2598
(760) 741-3141 • FAX (760) 741-9890

5 CORPORATE PARK SUITE 100
IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92606-4906
(949)-399-0600 • FAX (949) 399-0610

ATTACHMENT I PROCEDURES & FINDINGS

General Procedures

For 90% of the Building Fund cash disbursements we reviewed the supporting invoices and/or underlying contracts to determine that the expenditures were approved as permitted expenditures under Proposition G as defined in the letter from Sidley Austin LLP to the Grossmont Healthcare District dated September 19, 2008.

No exceptions were found as a result of applying this procedure.

Specific Procedures

Architect, Code Review and Project Management Firms

For cash disbursements to the architect firms, the code review consultants, and to the project management firms, the invoice(s) were reviewed to determine that the charges for labor were associated with Proposition G projects. The reimbursable costs were reviewed to determine that the charges were approved as reimbursable costs permitted under the contracts and were not for equipment or items that would not be related to Proposition G design work or project management projects.

No exceptions were found as a result of applying the procedure.

Inspection Companies

For cash disbursements to the inspection companies, the invoice(s) were reviewed to determine that the charges for labor were associated with Proposition G projects. The reimbursable costs were reviewed to determine that the charges were approved as reimbursable costs permitted under the contracts and were not for equipment or items that would not be related to Proposition G projects.

No exceptions were found as a result of applying this procedure.

Construction Companies

For cash disbursements to the construction companies, the invoice(s) were reviewed to determine that the charges were either associated with original line items that were approved as part of the original contract or associated with a change order. The reimbursable costs were reviewed to determine that the charges were approved as reimbursable costs permitted under the contracts and were not for equipment or items that would not be related to Proposition G projects.

No exceptions were found as a result of applying this procedure.

**ATTACHMENT I
PROCEDURES & FINDINGS CONTINUED**

OSHPD and Cal Trans

For cash disbursements to the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development (OSHPD) and Cal Trans the invoice(s) were reviewed to determine that the charges were approved as reimbursable costs permitted under the contracts and were not for equipment or items that would not be related to Proposition G projects.

No exceptions were found as a result of applying this procedure.

Sharp HealthCare

For cash disbursements to Sharp HealthCare the invoice(s) were reviewed to determine that the charges were approved as reimbursable costs permitted under the contracts and were not for equipment or items that would not be related to Proposition G projects.

No exceptions were found as a result of applying this procedure.