CITY OF FLAGSTAFF, ARIZONA
SINGLE AUDIT ACT REPORTS
YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2016

CITY OF FLAGSTAFF, ARIZONA TABLE OF CONTENTS YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2016

INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING AND ON COMPLIANCE AND OTHER MATTERS BASED ON AN AUDIT OF BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS	1
INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT ON COMPLIANCE FOR EACH MAJOR PROGRAM, ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER COMPLIANCE, AND REPORT ON THE SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS AS REQUIRED BY THE UNIFORM GUIDANCE	3
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS	
SUMMARY OF AUDITORS' RESULTS	6
FINANCIAL STATEMENT FINDINGS	7
FEDERAL AWARD FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS	7
SUMMARY SCHEDULE OF PRIOR AUDIT FINDINGS	8
SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS	9
NOTES TO SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS	12



INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING AND ON COMPLIANCE AND OTHER MATTERS BASED ON AN AUDIT OF BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS

Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council City of Flagstaff, Arizona Flagstaff, Arizona

We have audited, in accordance with the auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, the financial statements of the governmental activities, the business-type activities, each major fund, and the aggregate remaining fund information of the City of Flagstaff, Arizona (City), as of and for the year ended June 30, 2016, and the related notes to the financial statements, which collectively comprise the City's basic financial statements, and have issued our report thereon dated December 28, 2016.

Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

In planning and performing our audit of the financial statements, we considered the City's internal control over financial reporting (internal control) to determine the audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances for the purpose of expressing our opinions on the financial statements, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the City's internal control. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the City's internal control.

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

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



Compliance and Other Matters

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

Purpose of this Report

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

CliftonLarsonAllen LLP

Clifton Larson Allen LLP

Phoenix, Arizona December 28, 2016





INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT ON COMPLIANCE FOR EACH MAJOR FEDERAL PROGRAM, REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER COMPLIANCE, AND REPORT ON THE SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS AS REQUIRED BY THE UNIFORM GUIDANCE

Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council City of Flagstaff, Arizona Flagstaff, Arizona

Report on Compliance for Each Major Federal Program

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

Management's Responsibility

Management is responsible for compliance with federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of its federal awards applicable to its federal programs.

Auditors' Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on compliance for each of the City's major federal programs based on our audit of the types of compliance requirements referred to above. We conducted our audit of compliance in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America; the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States; and the audit requirements of Title 2 U.S. *Code of Federal Regulations* Part 200, *Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards* (Uniform Guidance). Those standards and the Uniform Guidance require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether noncompliance with the types of compliance requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on a major federal program occurred. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence about the City's compliance with those requirements and performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion on compliance for each major federal program. However, our audit does not provide a legal determination of the City's compliance.

Opinion on Each Major Federal Program

In our opinion, the City of Flagstaff, Arizona complied, in all material respects, with the types of compliance requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on each of its major federal programs for the year ended June 30, 2016.



Other Matters

The results of our auditing procedures disclosed an instance of noncompliance which is required to be reported in accordance with the Uniform Guidance and which is described in the following paragraph and in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs as item 2016-001. Our opinion on each major federal program is not modified with respect to this item.

This report replaces the previously issued report dated December 28, 2016. Subsequent to the report dated December 28, 2016, the City determined a program reported on the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards was identified under an incorrect Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number. The Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards has therefore been restated to properly identify Community Development Block Grant (CDBG; CFDA Number 14.218) expenditures previously reported in the Home Investment Partnership Program (14.239). As a result of this change, the CDBG program was determined to be a major program.

The City's response to the noncompliance finding identified in our audit is described in the accompanying schedule of finings and questioned costs. The City's response was not subject to auditing procedures applied in the audit of compliance and, accordingly, we express no opinion on the response.

Report on Internal Control Over Compliance

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

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

Our consideration of internal control over compliance was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control over compliance that might be material weaknesses or significant deficiencies and therefore, material weaknesses or significant deficiencies may exist that have not been identified. We identified a deficiency in internal control over compliance, as described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs as item 2016-001, which we consider to be a material weakness.

Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council City of Flagstaff, Arizona

The City's response to the internal control over compliance finding identified in our audit is described in the accompanying scheduled of findings and questioned costs. The City's response was not subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of compliance and, accordingly, we express no opinion on the response.

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

Report on Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards Required by the Uniform Guidance

We have audited the financial statements of the governmental activities, the business-type activities, each major fund, and the aggregate remaining fund information of the City as of and for the year ended June 30, 2016, and the related notes to the financial statements, which collectively comprise the City's basic financial statements. We issued our report thereon dated December 28, 2016, which contained unmodified opinions on those financial statements. Our audit was conducted for the purpose of forming opinions on the financial statements that collectively comprise the basic financial statements. The accompanying schedule of expenditures of federal awards is presented for purposes of additional analysis as required by the Uniform Guidance and is not a required part of the basic financial statements. Such information is the responsibility of management and was derived from and relates directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the basic financial statements. The information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the financial statements and certain additional procedures, including comparing and reconciling such information directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the basic financial statements or to the basic financial statements themselves, and other additional procedures in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. In our opinion, the schedule of expenditures of federal awards is fairly stated in all material respects in relation to the basic financial statements as a whole.

CliftonLarsonAllen LLP

Clifton Larson Allen LLP

Phoenix, Arizona December 28, 2016

(Except for our opinion on the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards and our opinion on compliance for the Community Development Block Grant (14.218) described in the Other Matter above, as to which the date is August 31, 2017)

CITY OF FLAGSTAFF, ARIZONA SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2016

SECTION I – SUMMARY OF AUDITORS' RESULTS

Financial Statements

Type of auditor's report issued:	Unmodified
Internal control over financial reporting:	
Material weakness(es) identified?	yesXno
• Significant deficiency(ies) identified?	yes X none reported
Noncompliance material to financial statements noted?	yesXno
Federal Awards	
Internal control over major programs:	
Material weakness(es) identified?	Xno
• Significant deficiency(ies) identified?	yes X none reported
Type of auditor's report issued on compliance for major programs:	Unmodified
Any audit findings disclosed that are required to be reported in accordance with 2 CFR 200.516(a)?	X yes no
Identification of major programs:	
<u>CFDA Numbers</u> 14.218 14.871	Name of Federal Program or Cluster Community Development Block Grant Housing Choice Voucher Program
Dollar threshold used to distinguish between Type A and Type B programs:	\$750,000
Auditee qualified as low-risk auditee?	X yes no

CITY OF FLAGSTAFF, ARIZONA SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS (CONTINUED) YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2016

SECTION II – FINANCIAL STATEMENT FINDINGS

None noted

SECTION III - FEDERAL AWARD FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS

2016-001

Department of Housing and Urban Development Community Development Block Grant CFDA Number: 14.218

Pass Through Entity: Coconino County, Arizona

Pass Through Number: 120-15

Award Period: July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016 Material Weakness and Noncompliance

Condition: The City did not properly identify federal expenditures on its schedule of federal expenditures, resulting in a federal program not being properly identified as a major program.

Criteria: Title 2, Subtitle A, Chapter II, Part 200, Subpart F, Section 200.508 requires that the City prepare a schedule of federal expenditures which properly identifies each federal program. Section 200.518 requires that auditors perform a risk-assessment to identify major federal programs based on criteria defined within the Uniform Guidance.

Context: Expenditures of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) passed through Coconino County, Arizona were improperly identified as Home Investment Partnership Program expenditures on the City's schedule of federal expenditures, resulting in the CDBG program not being properly identified as a major program.

Known Questioned Costs: None Likely Questioned Costs: None

Cause: The City has an intergovernmental agreement with the County in which the County will provide reimbursement to the City through either the Community Development Block Grant or through the Home Investment Partnership Program. The City submitted reimbursement assuming the reimbursement was funded through the Home Investment Partnership Program; however, the County subsequently provided funding through CDBG.

Effect: Noncompliance with Uniform Guidance requirements as presentation of the schedule of expenditures of federal awards was not accurate, resulting in the CDBG program meeting the requirements of the major program determination.

Corrective Action Plan: The City restated the June 30, 2016 schedule of federal expenditures, which resulted in an additional major program being audited. Additionally, the City has subsequently implemented controls to reconcile the remittance of funds from the grantor to the original reimbursement request to prevent a similar occurrence in the future.

Responsible Official: Brandi Suda, Finance Director

CITY OF FLAGSTAFF, ARIZONA SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS (CONTINUED) YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2016

SECTION IV - SUMMARY SCHEDULE OF PRIOR AUDIT FINDINGS

2015-A: Accuracy of Aggregation of Financial Data Related to Impaired Assets and Insurance Proceeds

Condition: Certain activities of the City's multiple locations were not accurately reported in the City's financial reporting system. Specifically, the City was knowledgeable of certain asset impairments and related insurance proceeds related to activities at the City's public housing facility that were not reported in the City's financial reporting system.

Status: Corrected. No similar instances were noted in the current year.

2015-B: Timely and Accurate Reconciliation of Miscellaneous Receivables

Condition: Certain reconciliations of significant miscellaneous receivable accounts were not performed timely and accurately. Due to this oversight, a significant misstatement in miscellaneous receivable and revenue account balances was not identified prior to the audit.

Status: Corrected. No similar instances were noted in the current year.

2015-C: Discovery of Facts Subsequent to the Issuance of the Audit Report

Condition: Subsequent to the issuance of the City's audited financial statements as of June 30, 2015, dated December 30, 2015, City management identified an error in the originally issued report. Restricted net position for governmental activities in the government-wide statement of net position was not correctly stated, as much of the restricted net position was included in unrestricted net position. City management approached the auditor regarding the misstatement of restrictions and made the determination to reissue the financial statements.

Status: Corrected. No similar instances were noted in the current year.

CITY OF FLAGSTAFF, ARIZONA SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2016

Federal Grantor/Passthrough Grantor/Program Title	Federal CFDA Number	Contract/Grant Number	Award Amount	Expenditures	Subrecipients/ Pass-through	
					<u></u>	
Department of Agriculture	_					
Passed through Arizona State Forestry Division						
Cooperative Forestry Assistance-Western Bark Beetle Initiative	10.664	WBBI 13-601	\$ 100,000	\$ 60,890	\$ -	
Cooperative Forestry Assistance-Western Bark Beetle Initiative	10.664	WBBI 11-601	100,000	100,000		
Total Department of Agriculture				160,890	-	
Department of Commerce						
Direct Programs:	_					
Economic Adjustment Assistance-Business Accelerator & EOC	11.307	07-79-06817	4,000,000	521,834	-	
Department of Housing and Urban Development	_					
Direct Programs:	44.040	D 40 MO 04 0540	505 770	70 500		
Community Development Block Grant 2013-2014	14.218	B-13-MC-04-0510	565,772	72,522	-	
Community Development Block Grant 2014-2015	14.218	B-14-MC-04-0510	570,941	252,649	-	
Community Development Block Grant 2015-2016	14.218	B-15-MC-04-0510	579,591	368,504	- 240 002	
Disbursements to Sub-Recipients	14.218				218,892	
Passed through Coconino County, Arizona:	14.218	120-15	200 074	140.064		
Community Development Block Grant	14.216	120-15	266,871	148,864 842.539	240,002	
Total CDBG Program				842,539	218,892	
Public and Indian Housing	14.850	AZ006-00000115D	292,601	145,837	-	
Public and Indian Housing	14.850	AZ006-00000116D	280,869	153,109	-	
Public and Indian Housing	14.850	AZ006-00000215D	324,586	161,780	-	
Public and Indian Housing	14.850	AZ006-00000216D	307,086	167,679		
Total Public and Indian Housing				628,405	-	
Public Housing Capital Fund	14.872	AZ20P00650113	348,130	126,740	_	
Public Housing Capital Fund	14.872	AZ20P00650114	362,437	190,081	-	
Public Housing Capital Fund	14.872	AZ20P00650115	357,680	83,846	-	
Public Housing Capital Fund	14.872	AZ20P00650116	368,966	1,352	-	
Total Public Housing Capital Fund				402,019	-	
Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher	14.871	AZ006	3,703,477	3,566,851	-	
Lower Income Housing Assistance Program - Section 8 Moderate Rehab	14.856	AZ006MRO001/ AZ006SRO001	78,992	78,990	-	
		A20003R0001				
Passed through Arizona Department of Housing:	44.000	005.40	205.000	7404		
Home Investment Partnership Program 2013	14.239	305-13	385,000	74,347		
Total Department of Housing and Urban Development				5,593,151	218,892	
Department of Interior	_					
Direct Programs:						
National Park Service Conservation, Protection, Outreach and Education	15.054	D104C40700	E 000	F 000		
-Dispatch Services	15.954	P12AC10702	5,000	5,000	-	
Reclamation Water Supply Program-Red Gap Ranch Feasibility Study	15.548	R12AP32025	300,000	11,032	_	
Total Department of Interior	. 5.0 10	02020	000,000	16,032		
. I I Department of mone.				10,002	(Continued)	
					(55554)	

CITY OF FLAGSTAFF, ARIZONA SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS (CONTINUED) YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2016

	Federal				
Federal Grantor/Passthrough	CFDA	Contract/Grant	Award	Even am diturna	Subrecipients/
Grantor/Program Title Department of Justice	Number	Number	Amount	Expenditures	Pass-through
Passed through State of Arizona:					
Arizona Internet Crimes Against Children Training 2015	16.543	2012-MC-FX-K008	\$ 9,859	\$ 3,675	\$ -
Direct Programs:					
Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program FY14	16.738	2014-DJ-BX-1198	24,330	12,974	-
Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program FY15 Total Justice Assistance Grant Program	16.738	2015-DJ-BX-0580	20,749	14,435 27,409	-
Bulletproof Vest Partnership Program 2013	16.607	2013 BVP	24,453	8,704	_
Bulletproof Vest Partnership Program 2014	16.607	2014 BVP	15,440	15,440	-
Bulletproof Vest Partnership Program 2015	16.607	2015 BVP	15,440	15,440	<u> </u>
Total Bulletproof Vest Partnership Program				39,584	-
Passed through Arizona Criminal Justice Commission:					
Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program Cycle 29	16.803	DC-16-002	116,664	116,664	
Total Department of Justice				187,332	-
Department of Transportation					
Direct Programs:					
Airport Improvement Program-AIP 37	20.106	AIP-3-04-0015-037-2013	270,000	103,506	-
Airport Improvement Program-AIP 38	20.106	AIP-3-04-0015-038-2015	293,500	12,286	-
Airport Improvement Program-AIP 39	20.106	AIP-3-04-0015-039-2015	500,000	16,229	
Total Airport Improvement Program				132,021	-
Passed through Arizona Department of Transportation:					
Highway Planning and Construction - 2011 STP	20.205	JPA11-085	105,000	208,489	-
Highway Planning and Construction - 2015 PL	20.205	JPA11-085	92,899	4,438	-
Highway Planning and Construction - 2016 PL Highway Planning and Construction - 2016 SPR	20.205 20.205	JPA11-085 JPA11-085	110,675 124,030	110,675 124,030	-
Regional Trails Program-FUTS Sign Project	20.203	PR11-049	227,777	69,040	-
Passed through Arizona State Parks:	20.219	11(11-043	221,111	03,040	
Picture Canyon Trail Improvements	20.219	IGA 11-049-RTP 471510	74.446	316	_
Total Highway Planning and Construction Cluster			,	516,988	-
Passed through Arizona Department of Transportation:					
Highway Planning and Construction - FTA 5304 Transit Spine Study	20.505	JPA11-085	375,000	186,649	-
Public Transportation Research-2015 FTA(22)	20.505	JPA-11-085	36,121	23,387	-
Public Transportation Research-2016 FTA(23)	20.505	JPA-11-085	36,733	34,309	
Total FTA Program				244,345	-
Passed through Arizona's Governor's Office of Highway Safety:					
State & Community Highway Safety-DUI/Youth Alcohol Enforcement	20.600	2015-AL-006	25,000	15,569	-
State & Community Highway Safety-Portable Privacy Barrier	20.600	2015-AI-013	4,898	-	-
State & Community Highway Safety-Traffic Enforcement Radar Unit	20.600	2015-PT-053	11,459	-	-
State & Community Highway Safety DLIII/Couth Alcohol Enforcement	20.600	2015-405D-500	7,209	4.500	-
State & Community Highway Safety DUI/Youth Alcohol Enforcement	20.600	2016-AL-008	20,000	4,509	-
State & Community Highway Safety-DUI OT Task Force State & Community Highway Safety-Ped Safety Equip Bikes	20.600 20.600	2016-II-011 2016-PS-007	20,000 8,636	16,994 6,778	-
State & Community Highway Safety-Fed Safety Equip bikes State & Community Highway Safety-STEP Enforcement Equipment	20.600	2016-PT-062	32,253	31,433	-
Total Highway Safety Cluster	20.000	201011 002	02,200	75,283	
Total Department of Transportation				968,637	
·					(Continued)

See accompanying notes to schedules of expenditures of federal awards.

CITY OF FLAGSTAFF, ARIZONA SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS (CONTINUED) YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2016

Federal Grantor/Passthrough	Federal CFDA	Contract/Grant	Award				Subr	ecipients/
Grantor/Program Title	Number	Number	Amount		Expenditures		Pass-through	
Institute Of Museum And Library Services								
Passed through AZ State Library, Archives & Public Records:	•							
Grants to States-State Grant in Aid	45.310	2016 SGIA	\$	25,000	\$	19,401	\$	-
Grants to States-Preserve and Honoring Flagstaff's Past	45.310	2013 LSTA		11,900		-		-
Grants to States - Storytime Project	45.310	2013 LSTA		18,365		3,788		-
Grants to States - Toddler Tools for Tuba City	45.310	2013 LSTA		14,070		5,130		-
Grants to States - Expanding Access to STEM	45.310	2014 LSTA		16,650		5,031		-
Grants to States - Crafting Creative Communities	45.310	2016 LSTA		16,650		507		
Total Institute of Museum and Library Services						33,857		-
Environmental Protection Agency								
Direct Programs:								
Brownfields Assessment & Cleanup Cooperative Agreement	66.818	00T97401		700,000		181,223		-
Distributions to Sub-Recipients	66.818							121,995
Total Environmental Protection Agency						181,223		121,995
Department of Homeland Security								
Direct Programs:	•							
FEMA Floodplain Management Plan	97.045	EMW-2014-CA-00087		200,000		120,000		-
FEMA Floodplain Indirect	97.045	EMW-2014-CA-00087		14,574		9,432		-
Total Department of Homeland Security						129,432		
,								
Total Expenditures of Federal Awards					\$	7,792,388	\$	340,887

CITY OF FLAGSTAFF, ARIZONA NOTES TO SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2016

NOTE 1 BASIS OF PRESENTATION

The accompanying schedule of expenditures of federal awards (the "Schedule") includes the federal award activity of the City of Flagstaff, Arizona under programs of the federal government for the year ended June 30, 2016. The information in this Schedule is presented in accordance with the requirements of 2 CFR Part 200, *Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance).* Because the Schedule presents only a selected portion of the operations of Example Entity, it is not intended to and does not present the financial position, changes in net position, or cash flows of the City of Flagstaff, Arizona.

NOTE 2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

Expenditures reported on the Schedule are reported on the modified accrual basis of accounting. Such expenditures are recognized following the cost principles contained in the Uniform Guidance, wherein certain types of expenditures are not allowable or are limited as to reimbursement. The City of Flagstaff, Arizona has not elected to use the 10-percent de minimis indirect cost rate as allowed under the Uniform Guidance.

NOTE 3 INDIRECT COST

The City did not elect the ten percent de minimus indirect cost rate.