# SIXTEENTH (16th) JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - DISTRICT JUDGE

New Iberia, Louisiana

Financial Report

Year Ended December 31, 2022

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Independent Auditor's Report	1-3
BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS	
GOVERNMENT-WIDE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS:	
Statement of Net Position	6
Statement of Activities	7
FUND FINANCIAL STATEMENTS:	
Balance Sheet-Governmental Funds	9
Reconciliation of the Governmental Funds Balance	
Sheet to the Statement of Net Position	10
Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes	
in Fund Balances-Governmental Funds	11
Reconciliation of the Statement of Revenues, Expenditures,	
and Changes in Fund Balances of Governmental Funds to	
the Statement of Activities	12
Notes to Financial Statements	13-31
REQUIRED SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION	
Budgetary Comparison Schedules:	
General Fund	33
Hearing Officer Fund	34
St. Mary Parish Drug Court Testing Fund	35
Schedule of Changes in Total OPEB Liability and Related Ratios	36
Schedule of Employer's Share of Net Pension Liability (Asset)	37
Schedule of Employer Contributions	38
Notes to Required Supplementary Information	39
SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION	
Justice System Funding Schedules - Receiving Entity:	
Judicial Expense Fund (General Fund)	41
Hearing Officer Fund	42
St. Mary Parish Drug Court Testing Fund	43
OTHER INFORMATION	
Budgetary Comparison Schedules With Comparative Actual	
Amounts for the Prior Year:	
General Fund	44
Hearing Officer Fund	45
St. Mary Parish Drug Court Testing Fund	46
INTERNAL CONTROL, COMPLIANCE AND OTHER MATTERS	
Independent Auditor's Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting	
and on Compliance and Other Matters Based on an Audit	
of Financial Statements Performed in Accordance with Government Auditing Standards	48-49
<del>-</del>	40-49
Summary Schedule of Current and Prior Year Audit Findings	<b>5</b> 0
and Management's Corrective Action Plan	50

## **KOLDER, SLAVEN & COMPANY, LLC**

CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

Brad E. Kolder, CPA, JD\*
Gerald A. Thibodeaux, Jr., CPA\*
Robert S. Carter, CPA\*
Arthur R. Mixon, CPA\*
Stephen J. Anderson, CPA\*
Matthew E. Margaglio, CPA\*
Casey L. Ardoin, CPA, CFE\*
Wanda F. Arcement, CPA
Bryan K. Joubert, CPA
Nicholas Fowlkes, CPA
Deidre L. Stock, CPA

C. Burton Kolder, CPA\*
Of Counsel

Victor R. Slaven, CPA\* - retired 2020 Christine C. Doucet, CPA – retired 2022

\* A Professional Accounting Corporation

183 S. Beadle Rd. Lafayette, LA 70508 Phone (337) 232-4141

232-4141 Phone (225) 293-8300 450 E. Main St. 71301 New Iberia, LA 70560

1428 Metro Dr. Alexandria, LA 71301 Phone (318) 442-4421

Phone (337) 367-9204 1201 David Dr.

11929 Bricksome Ave.

Baton Rouge, LA 70816

200 S. Main St. Abbeville, LA 70510 Phone (337) 893-7944

1201 David Dr. Morgan City, LA 70380 Phone (985) 384-2020

434 E. Main St. Ville Platte, LA 70586 Phone (337) 363-2792 332 W. Sixth Ave. Oberlin, LA 70655 Phone (337) 639-4737

WWW.KCSRCPAS.COM

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT

To the Honorable Judges of the Sixteenth Judicial District Court-District Judge Parishes of Iberia, St. Martin and St. Mary, Louisiana New Iberia, Louisiana

### **Report on the Audit of the Financial Statements**

### **Opinions**

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of the governmental activities and each major fund of the Sixteenth Judicial District Court-District Judge (District Court Judge) as of and for the year ended December 31, 2022, and the related notes to the financial statements, which collectively comprise the District Court Judge's basic financial statements as listed in the table of contents.

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the respective financial position of the governmental activities and each major fund of the District Court Judge, as of December 31, 2022, and the respective changes in financial position thereof for the year then ended in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

### **Basis for Opinions**

We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Our responsibilities under those standards are further described in the Auditor's Responsibilities for the Audit of the Financial Statements section of our report. We are required to be independent of Sixteenth Judicial District Court-District Judge, and to meet our other ethical responsibilities, in accordance with the relevant ethical requirements relating to our audit. We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our audit opinions.

### Responsibilities of Management for the Financial Statements

Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of these financial statements in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America; and for the design, implementation, and maintenance of internal control relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

In preparing the financial statements, management is required to evaluate whether there are conditions or events, considered in the aggregate, that raise substantial doubt about Sixteenth Judicial District Court-District Judge's ability to continue as a going concern for twelve months beyond the financial statement date, including any currently known information that may raise substantial doubt shortly thereafter.

#### Auditor's Responsibilities for the Audit of the Financial Statements

Our objectives are to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements as a whole are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error, and to issue an auditor's report that includes our opinions. 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 generally accepted auditing standards and *Government Auditing Standards* will always detect a material misstatement when it exists. The risk of not detecting a material misstatement resulting from fraud is higher than for one resulting from error, as fraud may involve collusion, forgery, intentional omissions, misrepresentations, or the override of internal control. Misstatements 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.

In performing an audit in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and *Government Auditing Standards*, we exercise professional judgment and maintain professional skepticism throughout the audit. We identify and assess the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to fraud or error, and design and perform audit procedures responsive to those risks. Such procedures include examining, on a test basis, evidence regarding the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. We obtain an understanding of internal control relevant to the audit in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of Sixteenth Judicial District Court-District Judge's internal control. Accordingly, no such opinion is expressed. We also evaluate the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluate the overall presentation of the financial statements. We conclude whether, in our judgment, there are conditions or events, considered in the aggregate, that raise substantial doubt about Sixteenth Judicial District Court-District Judge's ability to continue as a going concern for a reasonable period of time.

We are required to communicate with those charged with governance regarding, among other matters, the planned scope and timing of the audit, significant audit findings, and certain internal control-related matters that we identified during the audit.

#### Required Supplementary Information

Accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America require that the budgetary comparison information, schedule of changes in total OPEB liability and related ratios, schedule of employer's share of net pension liability (asset), and schedule of employer contributions on pages 33 through 39 be presented to supplement the basic financial statements. Such information is the responsibility of management, and, although not a part of the basic financial statements, is required by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board, who considers it to be an essential part of financial reporting for placing the basic financial statements in an appropriate operational, economic, or historical context. We have applied certain limited procedures to the required supplementary information in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America, which consisted of inquiries of management about the methods of preparing the information and comparing the information for consistency with management's responses to our inquiries, the basic financial statements, and other knowledge we obtained during our audit of the basic financial statements. We do not express an opinion or provide any assurance on the information because the limited procedures do not provide us with sufficient evidence to express an opinion or provide any assurance.

Management has omitted management's discussion and analysis that accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America require to be presented to supplement the basic financial statements. Such missing information, although not a part of the basic financial statements, is required by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board, who considers it to be an essential part of financial reporting for placing the basic financial statements in an appropriate operational, economic, or historical context. Our opinion on the basic financial statements is not affected by this missing information.

### Supplementary Information

Our audit was conducted for the purpose of forming opinions on the financial statements that collectively comprise the Sixteenth Judicial District Court-District Judge's basic financial statements. The justice system funding schedules on pages 41 through 43 are presented for purposes of additional analysis and are 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 basic financial statements and certain additional procedures, including comparing and reconciling such information directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the basic financial statements or to the basic financial statements themselves, and other additional procedures in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. In our opinion, the justice system funding schedules are fairly stated in all material respects in relation to the basic financial statements as a whole.

### Other Information

Management is responsible for the other information included in the annual report. The other information comprises the budgetary comparison schedules with comparative actual on pages 44 through 46 but does not include the basic financial statements and our auditor's report thereon. Our opinions on the basic financial statements do not cover the other information, and we do not express an opinion or any form of assurance thereon.

In connection with our audit of the basic financial statements, our responsibility is to read the other information and consider whether a material inconsistency exists between the other information and the basic financial statements, or the other information otherwise appears to be materially misstated. If, based on the work performed, we conclude that an uncorrected material misstatement of the other information exists, we are required to describe it in our report.

### Other Reporting Required by Government Auditing Standards

In accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*, we have also issued our report dated May 25, 2023, on our consideration of the District Court Judge's internal control over financial reporting and on our tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements and other matters. The purpose of that report is to describe the scope of our testing of internal control over financial reporting and compliance and the results of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on the effectiveness of the District Court Judge's internal control over financial reporting or on compliance. That report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* in considering the District Court Judge's internal control over financial reporting and compliance.

Kolder, Slaven & Company, LLC
Certified Public Accountants

New Iberia, Louisiana May 25, 2023 BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

GOVERNMENT-WIDE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (GWFS)

### SIXTEENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT-DISTRICT JUDGE

Parishes of Iberia, St. Martin and St. Mary

### Statement of Net Position December 31, 2022

	Governmental Activities
ASSETS	
Current assets:	<b>0.105110</b>
Cash and interest-bearing deposits	\$ 1,271,109
Investments  Due from other governments	1,607,671 426,178
Prepaid expenses	972
Total current assets	3,305,930
Noncurrent assets:	
Capital assets, net of accumulated depreciation	35,486
Net pension asset	686,127
Total noncurrent assets	721,613
TOTAL ASSETS	4,027,543
DEFERRED OUTFLOWS OF RESOURCES	
Pensions	201,029
Other postemployment benefits	772,835
Total deferred outflows of resources	973,864
LIABILITIES	
Current liabilities:	33,343
Accounts payable Accrued liabilities	10,353
Due to other governments	7,157
Total current liabilities	50,853
Noncurrent liabilities:	
OPEB liability	3,677,636
TOTAL LIABILITIES	3,728,489
DEFERRED INFLOWS OF RESOURCES	
Pensions	665,415
Other postemployment benefits	588,953
Total deferred inflows of resources	1,254,368
NET POSITION	
Net investment in capital assets	35,486
Unrestricted (deficit)	(16,936)
TOTAL NET POSITION	\$ 18,550

### Statement of Activities Year Ended December 31, 2022

				Governmental Activities
		Program	Net (Expense)	
		Charges for	Operating	Revenue and
		Services and	Grants and	Change in
Functions/Programs	Expenses	Fines	Contributions	Net Position
Governmental activities:				
Public safety -				
District Court	\$ 366,473	\$ 552,856	\$139,796	\$ 326,179
Hearing Officer	769,805	699,486	-	(70,319)
St. Mary Drug Court Testing	51	1,290	<del>-</del>	1,239
Total governmental activities	\$ 1,136,329	\$1,253,632	\$139,796	257,099
	General revenu	ec.		
	Interest incon			27,297
		er contributions		12,049
	Miscellaneou			3,841
		eneral revenues		43,187
	•			
	Change	in net position		300,286
	Net position (de	eficit), January 1, 2	022	(281,736)
	Net position, D	ecember 31, 2022		\$ 18,550

FUND FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

### Balance Sheet Governmental Funds December 31, 2022

	General Fund	Hearing Officer Fund	St. Mary Drug Court Testing Fund	Total Governmental Funds
Assets:				
Cash and interest-bearing deposits	\$ 690,994	\$ 571,027	\$ 9,088	\$ 1,271,109
Investments	608,788	987,228	11,655	1,607,671
Due from other governments	368,929	57,249	-	426,178
Due from other funds	-	92,500	-	92,500
Prepaid expenses	972			972
Total assets	\$ 1,669,683	\$ 1,708,004	\$ 20,743	\$ 3,398,430
Liabilities and Fund Balances				
Liabilities:				
Accounts payable	\$ 28,446	\$ 4,897	\$ -	\$ 33,343
Accrued liabilities	1,893	8,460	-	10,353
Due to other governments	7,157	-	-	7,157
Due to other funds	92,500			92,500
Total liabilities	129,996	13,357		143,353
Fund balances:				
Committed for court costs	-	1,694,647	-	1,694,647
Committed for drug testing	-	-	20,743	20,743
Unassigned	1,539,687			1,539,687
Total fund balances	1,539,687	1,694,647	20,743	3,255,077
Total liabilities and fund balances	\$ 1,669,683	\$ 1,708,004	\$ 20,743	\$ 3,398,430

### Reconciliation of the Governmental Funds Balance Sheet to the Statement of Net Position December 31, 2022

Total fund balance for governmental funds at December 31, 2022		\$ 3,255,077
Total net position reported for governmental activities in the statement of net position is different because:		
Capital assets used in governmental activities are not financial resources and therefore, are not reported in the funds. Those assets consist of:  Equipment and furniture, net of \$149,684 accumulated depreciation		35,486
The deferred outflows of expenditures for the OPEB and pension plans are not a use of current resources and, therefore, are not reported in the funds.		973,864
Long-term liabilities are not due and payable, and long-term assets are not available and receivable in the current period, and and therefore, are not reported in the governmental funds.		
Net OPEB obligation Net pension asset	\$ (3,677,636) 686,127	(2,991,509)
The deferred inflows of contributions for the OPEB and pension plans are no	ot	
available resources and, therefore, are not reported in the funds.		(1,254,368)
Net position at December 31, 2022		\$ 18,550

### Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balances-Governmental Funds Year Ended December 31, 2022

	General Fund	Hearing Officer Fund	St. Mary Drug Court Testing Fund	Total Governmental Funds
Revenues:				
Fees and fines	\$ 552,856	\$ 699,486	\$ 1,290	\$ 1,253,632
State grants	84,912	_	-	84,912
Parish government's reimbursements	54,884	_	_	54,884
Interest	10,435	16,667	195	27,297
Other	3,841	-	-	3,841
Total revenues	706,928	716,153	1,485	1,424,566
Expenditures:				
Current -				
Public safety:				
Salaries and related benefits	191,518	580,734	-	772,252
Operating services	52,758	19,520	-	72,278
Professional fees	35,586	22,445	-	58,031
Materials and supplies	60,823	12,039	-	72,862
Travel and other charges	41,096	10,330	51	51,477
Appropriations	92,069	-	-	92,069
Capital outlay	12,083	4,675		16,758
Total expenditures	485,933	649,743	51	1,135,727
Excess of revenues over expenditures	220,995	66,410	1,434	288,839
Other financing sources (uses):				
Transfers in (out)	11,407	(11,407)		
Net change in fund balances	232,402	55,003	1,434	288,839
Fund balances, beginning	1,307,285	1,639,644	19,309	2,966,238
Fund balances, ending	\$1,539,687	\$1,694,647	\$ 20,743	\$ 3,255,077

### SIXTEENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT-DISTRICT JUDGE

Parishes of Iberia, St. Martin and St. Mary

Reconciliation of the Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balances of the Governmental Funds to the Statement of Activities

For the Year Ended December 31, 2022

Total net changes in fund balances for the year ended December 31, 2022 per Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balances		\$ 288,839
The change in net position reported for governmental activities in the statement of activities is different because:		
Governmental funds report capital outlays as expenditures. However, in the statement of activities, the cost of those assets is allocated over their estimated useful lives and reported as depreciation expense.  Capital outlay which is considered expenditures on Statement		
of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balances	\$ 16,767	
Loss on disposals Depreciation expense for the year ended December 31, 2022	(160) (11,278)	5,329
Because some revenues are not considered measurable at year end,		
they are not considered "available" revenues in the governmental funds.  Non-employer contributions		12,049
Some expenses reported in the statement of activities do not require the use of current financial resources and therefore, are not reported as expenditures in the governmental funds.		
Pension benefit	265,021	
Other post-employment benefits	(270,952)	(5,931)
Total changes in net position for the year ended December 31, 2022 per Statement of Activities		\$ 300,286

#### Notes to Basic Financial Statements

#### INTRODUCTION

The Sixteenth Judicial District Court-District Judge (District Court Judge) is comprised of three parishes within the State of Louisiana: Iberia, St. Mary and St. Martin. The courthouses of the Sixteenth Judicial District are located in the three parish seats of New Iberia (Iberia Parish), Franklin (St. Mary Parish) and St. Martinville (St. Martin Parish). The caseload of the Sixteenth Judicial District Court is handled by eight judges, six are elected at-large and two are elected from sub-districts within the entire district. These judges all have general trial jurisdiction throughout the district and preside over individual divisions designated by the letters A through H as follows:

Division A	Honorable Anthony Thibodeaux
Division B	Honorable Suzanne deMahy
Division C	Honorable Vincent J. Borne
Division D	Honorable Lewis H. Pitman, Jr.
Division E	Honorable Keith R. J. Comeaux
Division F	Honorable Anthony J. Saleme, Jr.
Division G	Honorable Curtis Sigur
Division H	Honorable Roger P. Hamilton, Jr.

The District Court Judge was created by Louisiana Revised Statute (R.S.) 13:996.37, which provides for the creation of the Judicial Expense Fund (general fund) for the Sixteenth Judicial District. The District Court Judge previously had two general funds, the Judicial Expense Fund and the Criminal Court Fund, which were managed by the Iberia Parish Government. Effective April 1, 1994, an intergovernmental agreement was entered into allowing the said court funds to be administered by the office of the Sixteenth Judicial District Attorney in order to avoid the expense of staff and equipment necessary to administer the court funds. Effective in 1997, the Judicial Expense Fund began to be administered by the Sixteenth Judicial District Court and is accounted for separately in this report. The Criminal Court Fund is accounted for as a special revenue fund in the District Attorney's financial statements.

### (1) Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

### A. Reporting Entity

For financial reporting purposes, in conformance with Section 2100 of the Governmental Accounting Standards Board Codification of Governmental Accounting and Financial Reporting Standards (GASB Codification), the Sixteenth Judicial District Court-District Judge herein referred to as the District Court Judge, includes all funds and activities, et cetera, that are controlled by the District Court Judge, comprised of independently elected parish officials. As independently elected parish officials, the District Court Judge is solely responsible for the operations of its office, which includes the hiring or retention of employees, authority over budgeting, responsibility for deficits, and the receipt and disbursement of funds. Other than certain operating expenditures of the District Court Judge that are paid for or provided by the Iberia, St. Mary and St. Martin parish governments, such as maintenance and operation of the parish courthouses in which the District Court Judge's offices are located and funds for equipment and furniture of the District Court Judge, the District Court Judge is financially independent.

Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

Codification section 2100 established the following criteria for determining if a governmental entity is primary government or a component unit of a primary government.

- a. It has a separately elected governing body.
- b. It is legally separate.
- c. It is fiscally independent of other governments.

Because it meets the above criteria the District Court Judge is not considered a component unit of any other governmental entity, nor is it considered a primary government for any other governmental entities. Accordingly, the District Court Judge is a separate governmental reporting entity. The activities of the parish government, the general government services provided by that governmental unit or the other governmental units that comprise the financial reporting entity are not included within the accompanying financial statements as they are considered autonomous governments. These units of government issue financial statements separate from those of the District Court Judge.

### B. Basis of Presentation

The accompanying financial statements of the District Court Judge have been prepared in conformity with governmental accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. The Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) is the accepted standard-setting body for establishing governmental accounting and financial reporting principles. The accompanying basic financial statements have been prepared in conformity with the GASB codification.

Government-Wide Financial Statements (GWFS)

The statement of net position and statement of activities display information about the reporting government as a whole. They include all funds of the reporting entity. Governmental activities generally are financed through taxes, intergovernmental revenues, and other non-exchange revenues.

The statement of activities presents a comparison between direct expenses and program revenues for each function of the District Court Judge's governmental activities. Direct expenses are those that are specifically associated with a program or function and, therefore, are clearly identifiable to a particular function. Program revenues include (a) fees, fines, and charges paid by the recipients of goods or services offered by the programs, and (b) grants and contributions that are restricted to meeting the operational or capital requirements of a particular program. Revenues that are not classified as program revenues are presented as general revenues.

Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

### Fund Financial Statements (FFS)

The District Court Judge uses funds to report on its financial position and the results of its operations. Fund accounting is designed to demonstrate legal compliance and to aid financial management by segregating transactions relating to certain government functions or activities.

A fund is an independent fiscal and accounting entity with a separate set of self-balancing accounts that comprise its assets, liabilities, reserves, fund equity, revenues, and expenditures. Government resources are allocated to and accounted for in individual funds based upon the purposes for which they are to be spent and the restrictions, if any, on the spending activities.

#### Governmental Funds –

General Fund - The General Fund is the general operating fund of the District Court Judge. It is used to account for all financial resources relative to judicial expense funds. R.S. 13:996.37 provides for the collection of a \$35 court fee on every civil suit and a \$25 court fee on every criminal case over which the District Court Judge has jurisdiction and the defendant is convicted. These monies can be used to pay personnel, maintain the law library, purchase equipment, and supplies or other items necessary to efficiently operate the court.

### Special Revenue Funds –

IV-D Hearing Officer Fund – This fund was established by R.S. 46:236.5 to provide for the court to implement an expedited process for the establishment of enforcement of support. Such court may assess and collect a fee of not more than five percent of all existing and future support obligations to fund the administrative costs of the system for expedited process.

The St. Mary Parish Drug Court Testing Fund – This fund was established to collect fines and forfeitures, which are collected by the District Attorney Misdemeanor Probation Officers. Such monies will be deposited into this fund and will be administered through the Court Administrator's office for the purpose of supplementing the cost of drug testing.

### C. Measurement Focus/Basis of Accounting

Measurement focus is a term used to describe "which" transactions are recorded within the various financial statements. Basis of accounting refers to "when" transactions are recorded regardless of the measurement focus applied. Revenues, expenses, gains, losses, assets, liabilities, and deferred inflows of resources resulting from non-exchange transactions are recognized when the exchange takes place.

Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

Measurement focus - The government-wide financial statements are presented using the economic resources measurement focus. The accounting objectives of this measurement focus are the determination of operating income, changes in net position, and financial position. All assets, deferred outflows of resources, liabilities (whether current or non-current), and deferred inflows of resources associated with their activities are reported. All governmental funds utilize a current financial resources measurement focus in the fund financial statements. Only current financial assets and liabilities are generally included on the balance sheet. Operating statements present sources and uses of available spendable financial resources at the end of the period.

Basis of accounting - The government-wide financial statements are presented using the accrual basis of accounting. Revenues are recognized when earned and expenses are recognized when the exchange takes place. In the fund financial statements, governmental funds are presented on the modified accrual basis of accounting. Revenues are recognized when "measurable and available." Measurable means the amount of the transaction can be determined and available means collectible within the current period or soon enough thereafter. Expenditures are recorded when the related fund liability is incurred.

### D. Interfund Receivables and Payables

During the course of operations, transactions occur between individual funds that may result in amounts owed between funds. Those related to goods and service type transactions are classified as "due to and from other funds." Interfund receivables and payables are eliminated in the Statement of Net Position. Details of interfund receivables and payables at year-end are found in Note (4).

### E. <u>Cash and Investments</u>

Cash and interest-bearing deposits include amounts in demand deposits, interest-bearing demand deposits, and time deposits. Under state law, the District Court Judge may deposit funds in demand deposits, interest-bearing demand deposits, money market accounts, or time deposits with state banks organized under Louisiana law or any state of the United States, or under the laws of the United States. Investments are limited by R.S. 33:2955 and the District Court Judge's investment policy. At December 31, 2022, the investments of the District Court Judge consisted of investments in the Louisiana Asset Management Pool (LAMP). Investments in LAMP are stated at fair value.

### F. Capital Assets

All capital assets are capitalized at historical cost or estimated costs for assets where actual cost is not available. The District Court Judge maintains a threshold of \$1,000 or more for capitalizing capital assets. Capital assets are recorded in the government-wide financial statements but are not reported in the fund financial statements. All capital assets are depreciated using the straight-line method over their estimated useful lives. Useful lives vary from 5 to 7 years.

Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

### G. <u>Compensated Absences</u>

The District Court Judge has a uniform leave policy for general court employees, which include court administrator, hearing officers, their staff, judge's staff and the information technology manager. These employees earn ten days of sick leave per year and a set amount of annual vacation leave depending on years of service. However, vacation and sick leave are not allowed to be accumulated and carried over from one calendar year to the next, therefore, no provision for compensated absences has been made in the financial statements.

### H. Deferred Outflows of Resources and Deferred Inflows of Resources

In some instances, the GASB requires a government to delay recognition of decreases in net position as expenditures until a future period. In other instances, governments are required to delay recognition of increases in net position as revenues until a future period. In these circumstances, deferred outflows of resources and deferred inflows of resources result from the delayed recognition of expenditures or revenues, respectively. As of December 31, 2022, District Court Judge's deferred outflows of resources and deferred inflows of resources are attributable to the pension and OPEB plans.

### I. <u>Equity Classifications</u>

In the government-wide statements, equity is classified as net position and displayed in three components:

- a. Net investment in capital assets This component consists of net capital assets reduced by the outstanding balances of any related debt obligations and deferred inflows of resources attributable to the acquisition, construction, or improvement of those assets and increased by balances of deferred outflows of resources related to those assets.
- b. Unrestricted net position Net amount of the assets, deferred outflows of resources, liabilities, and deferred inflows of resources that are not included in either of the other two categories of net position.
- c. Restricted Consists of restricted assets reduced by liabilities and deferred inflows of resources related to those assets. Constraints may be placed on the use either by (1) external groups such as creditors, grantors, contributors, or laws or regulations of other governments; or (2) law through constitutional provisions or enabling legislation.

The District Court Judge has no restricted net position at December 31, 2022.

In the fund financial statements, governmental fund equity is classified as fund balance. Fund balances of governmental funds are classified as follows:

Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

- a. Nonspendable amounts that cannot be spent either because they are in nonspendable form or because they are legally or contractually required to be maintained intact.
- b. Restricted amounts that can be spent only for specific purposes because of constitutional provisions or enabling legislation or because of constraints that are externally imposed by creditors, grantors, contributors, or the laws or regulations of other governments.
- c. Committed amounts that can be used only for specific purposes determined by a formal decision of the District Court Judge which is the highest level of decision-making authority for the District Court Judge.
- d. Assigned amounts that do not meet the criteria to be classified as restricted or committed but that are intended to be used for specific purposes. Under the District Court Judges' policy, only the District Court Judge may assign amounts for specific purposes.
- e. Unassigned all other spendable amounts.

When an expenditure is incurred for the purposes for which both restricted and unrestricted fund balance is available, the District Court Judge considers restricted funds to have been spent first. When an expenditure is incurred for which committed, assigned, or unassigned fund balances are available, the District Court Judge considers amounts to have been spent first out of the committed funds, then assigned funds, and finally unassigned funds, as needed, unless the District Court Judge has provided otherwise in his commitment or assignment actions.

### J. <u>Interfund Transactions</u>

Quasi-external transactions are accounted for as revenues or expenditures. Transactions that constitute reimbursements to a fund for expenditures initially made from that fund, which are properly applicable to another fund, are recorded as expenditures in the reimbursing fund. All other interfund transactions, except quasi-external transactions and reimbursements, are reported as transfer. For the purpose of the statement of activities, all interfund transfers between individual governmental funds have been eliminated.

### K. <u>Accounting Estimates</u>

The preparation of financial statements in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and the reported amounts of revenues and expenditures during the reporting period. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

### (2) <u>Cash, Interest-Bearing Deposits and Investments</u>

#### A. Cash and Interest-bearing Deposits

Under state law, the District Court Judge may deposit funds within a fiscal agent bank organized under the laws of the State of Louisiana, the laws of any other state in the Union, or the laws of the United States. The District Court Judge may invest in certificates and time deposits of the state banks organized under Louisiana law and national banks having principal offices in Louisiana. At December 31, 2022, the District Court Judge had cash and interest-bearing demand deposits (book balances) totaling \$1,271,109.

Custodial credit risk for deposits is the risk that in the event of the failure of a depository financial institution, the District Court Judge's deposits may not be recovered or will not be able to recover collateral securities that are in the possession of an outside party. These deposits are stated at cost, which approximates market. Under state law, these deposits, (or the resulting bank balances) must be secured by federal deposit insurance or similar federal security or the pledge of securities owned by the fiscal agent bank. The market value of the pledged securities plus the federal deposit insurance must at all times equal the amount on deposit with the fiscal agent bank. These securities are held in the name of the District Court Judge or the pledging fiscal agent bank by a holding or custodial bank that is mutually acceptable to both parties. Deposit balances (bank balances) at December 31, 2022, are secured as follows:

Bank balances	<u>\$ 1,271,109</u>
Federal deposit insurance	250,000
Pledged securities	1,021,109
Total	\$ 1,271,109

Pledged securities in the amount of \$1,021,109 were exposed to custodial credit risk. These securities include uninsured or unregistered investments for which the securities are held by the bank, or by its trust department or agent, but not in the District Court Judge's name. Even though the pledged securities are considered uncollateralized, Louisiana Revised Statute 39:1229 imposes a statutory requirement on the custodial bank to advertise and sell the pledged securities within 10 days of being notified by the District Court Judge that the fiscal agent has failed to pay deposited funds upon demand. The District Court Judge does not have a policy for custodial credit risk.

Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

### B. <u>Investments</u>

Investments held at December 31, 2022 consist of \$1,607,671 in the Louisiana Asset Management Pool (LAMP).

LAMP is administered by LAMP, Inc., a non-profit corporation organized under the laws of the State of Louisiana. Only local governments having contracted to participate in LAMP have an investment interest in its pool of assets. The primary objective of LAMP is to provide a safe environment for the placement of public funds in short-term, high quality investments. The LAMP portfolio includes only securities and other obligations in which local governments in Louisiana are authorized to invest in accordance with LSA-R.S. 33:2955.

LAMP is a 2a7-like investment pool. The following facts are relevant for a 2a7-like investment pools.

- a. Credit risk: Lamp is rated AAAm by Standard & Poors.
- b. Custodial credit risk: In accordance with GASB Codification Section 150.128, the investment in LAMP is not exposed to custodial credit risk because LAMP participants' investments in the pool are evidence by shares of the pool and, therefore, not evidences by securities that exist in physical or book entry form. The District Court's investment is with the pool not the securities that make up the pool; therefore, no disclosure is required.
- c. Concentration of credit risk: Pooled investments are excluded from the 5 percent disclosure requirement.
- d. Inherent rate risk: LAMP is designed to be highly liquid to give its participants immediate access to their account balances. LAMP prepares its own interest rate risk disclosure using the weighted average maturity (WAM) method. The WAM of LAMP assets is restricted to not more than 90 days and consists of no securities with a maturity in excess of 397 or 762 days for U.S. Government variable rate investments. The WAM for LAMP's total investments is 52 days as of December 31, 2022.
- e. Foreign currency risk: Not applicable to 2a7-like securities.

The investments in LAMP are stated at fair value based on quoted market rates. The fair value is determined on a weekly basis by LAMP and the value of the position in the external investment pool is the same as the net asset value of the pool shares. LAMP, Inc. is subject to regulatory oversight of the state treasurer and the board of directors. LAMP is not registered with the SEC as an investment company.

The financial report for LAMP may be accessed on its website (www.lamppool.com).

Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

### (3) <u>Due from Other Governments</u>

Amounts due from other governments consisted of the following at December 31, 2022:

District Attorney: Criminal Court Fund	\$334,311
State of LA: Support Enforcement	57,249
Iberia Parish Government	8,335
St. Martin Parish Government	11,908
St. Mary Parish Government	14,375
Total due from other governments	\$ 426,178

### (4) Interfund Receivables and Payables

	Interfund Receivables	Interfund Payables
	Receivables	1 ayaores
General Fund	\$ -	\$ 92,500
Hearing Officer Fund	92,500	
	\$ 92,500	\$ 92,500

These receivables and payables reverse in the normal course of operations. All remaining balances resulted from time lag between the dates that (1) interfund goods and services are provided or reimbursable expenditures occur, (2) transactions are recorded in the accounting system, and (3) payment between the funds are made.

### (5) Capital Assets

Capital asset activity for the year ended December 31, 2022, is as follows:

	Balance 1/1/22	Additions	Deletions	Balance 12/31/22
Furniture and fixtures Less accumulated depreciation	\$ 178,628 (148,471)	\$ 16,767 (11,278)	\$ (10,225) 10,065	\$185,170 (149,684)
Capital assets, net of accumulated depreciation	\$ 30,157	\$ 5,489	<u>\$ (160)</u>	\$ 35,486

Depreciation expense for the year ended December 31, 2022, was charged to governmental activities of the District Court Judge as follows:

District Court	\$ 9,130
Hearing Officer Fund	2,148
Total demonstration armona	£11.270
Total depreciation expense	\$11,278

Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

### (6) <u>Post-Retirement Health Care Benefits</u>

Plan description – The Sixteenth Judicial District Court (the District Court) provides certain continuing health care and life insurance benefits for its retired employees. The Sixteenth Judicial District Court's OPEB Plan (the OPEB Plan) is a single-employer defined benefit OPEB plan administered by the District Court. The authority to establish and/or amend the obligation of the employer, employees and retirees rests with the District Court. No assets are accumulated in a trust that meets the criteria in Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) Codification Section P52 Postemployment Benefits Other Than Pensions—Reporting For Benefits Not Provided Through Trusts That Meet Specified Criteria—Defined Benefit.

Benefits Provided – Medical benefits are provided through comprehensive plans and are made available to employees upon actual retirement. Employees are covered by Plan A of the Parochial Employees' Retirement System of Louisiana, whose retirement eligibility (D.R.O.P. entry) provisions are as follows: 30 years of service at any age; age 55 and 25 years of service; age 60 and 10 years of service; or, age 65 and 7 years of service. For employees hired on and after January 1, 2007 retirement eligibility (D.R.O.P. entry) provisions are as follows: age 55 and 30 years of service; age 62 and 10 years of service; or, age 67 and 7 years of service.

Life insurance coverage is not considered for this valuation.

*Employees covered by benefit terms* – As of December 31, 2022, there were 22 active members and 8 retirees covered by the benefit terms.

### **Total OPEB Liability**

The District Court Judge's total OPEB liability of \$3,677,636 was measured as of December 31, 2022 and was determined by an actuarial valuation as of that date.

Actuarial Assumptions and other inputs – The total OPEB liability in the December 31, 2022 actuarial valuation was determined using the following actuarial assumptions and other inputs, applied to all periods included in the measurement, unless otherwise specified.

Inflation 2.0%

Salary increases 3.0%, including inflation

Discount rate 2.06% annually (Beginning of Year to Determine ADC)

3.72% annually (As of End of Year Measurement Date)

Healthcare cost trend rates PubG.H-2010 Mortality Getzen model

The discount rate was based on the Bond Buyers' 20 Year General Obligation municipal bond index as of December 31, 2022, the end of the applicable measurement period.

The actuarial assumptions used in the December 31, 2022 valuation were based on the results of the ongoing evaluations of the assumptions from January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2022.

Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

### **Changes in Total OPEB Liability**

Balance as of December 31, 2021	\$ 3,052,406
Changes for the year:	
Service cost	232,369
Interest	66,833
Differences between expected and actual experience	856,791
Changes in assumptions	(449,443)
Benefit payments and net transfers	(81,320)
Net changes	625,230
Balance as of December 31, 2022	\$ 3,677,636

Sensitivity of the total OPEB liability to changes in the discount rate – The following presents the total OPEB liability of the District Court Judge, as well as what the District Court Judge's total OPEB liability would be if it were calculated using a discount rate that is 1-percentage-point lower (2.720%) or 1-percentage-point higher (4.720%) than the current discount rate:

		Current		
	1% Decrease	Discount Rate	1% Increase	
	2.720%	3.720%	4.720%	
Total OPEB liability	\$ 4,261,623	\$ 3,677,636	\$ 3,203,838	

Sensitivity of the total OPEB liability to changes in the healthcare cost trend rates – The following presents the total OPEB liability of the District Court Judge, as well as what the District Court Judge's total OPEB liability would be if it were calculated using healthcare cost trend rates that are 1-percentage-point lower or 1-percentage-point higher than the current healthcare trend rates:

		Current		
	1% Decrease	Trend Rate	1% Increase	
	4.500%	5.500%	6.500%	
Total OPEB liability	\$ 3,167,121	\$ 3,677,636	\$ 4,312,660	

## OPEB Expense and Deferred Outflows of Resources and Deferred Outflows of Resources and Deferred Inflows of Resources Related to OPEB

For the year ended December 31, 2022, the District Court Judge recognized OPEB expense of \$352,272. As of December 31, 2022, the District Court Judge reported deferred outflows of resources and deferred inflows of resources related to OPEB from the following sources:

Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

	Deferred	Deferred
	Outflows of	Inflows of
	Resources	Resources
Differences between expected and actual experience	\$ 750,967	\$ (10,795)
Changes in assumptions	21,868	(578,158)
Total	\$ 772,835	\$ (588,953)

Amounts reported as deferred outflows of resources and deferred inflows of resources related to OPEB will be recognized in OPEB expense as follows:

### Years Ending December 31,

2023	\$ 53,070
2024	53,070
2025	53,070
2026	53,073
2027	(28,401)

#### Payable to the OPEB Plan

As of December 31, 2022, the District Court Judge did not have any amounts owed to the OPEB plan.

### (7) Employee Retirement System

The District Court Judge participates in a cost-sharing defined benefit plan, the Parochial Employees' Retirement Systems (PERS), which is administered by a separate public employee retirement system. Article X, Section 29(F) of the Louisiana Constitution of 1974 assigns the authority to establish and amend benefit provisions of all plans administered by this public employee retirement system to the State Legislature. This plan is not closed to new entrants. Substantially all District Court Judge's employees participate in the system.

### **Plan Description:**

PERS provides retirement, disability, and survivor benefits to eligible employees and their beneficiaries as defined in LRS 11:1901 and 11:1941. The District Court Judge participates in Plan A.

PERS' financial statements are prepared using the accrual basis of accounting. Employer and employee contributions are recognized in the period in which the employee is compensated for services performed. Benefits and refunds are recognized when due and payable in accordance with the terms of the plan. Interest income is recognized when earned.

A brief summary of eligibility and benefits of the plan are provided in the following table:

Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

Final average	Final average
salary	compensation
Years of service	30 years of any age
required and/or	25 years age 55 <sup>1</sup>
age eligible for	10 years age 60 <sup>1</sup>
benefits	7 years age 65 <sup>1</sup>

Benefit percent 3.00% per years of

per years of service

#### **Contributions**

Article X, Section 29(E)(2)(a) of the Louisiana Constitution of 1974 assigns the Legislature the authority to determine employee contributions. Employer contributions are actuarially determined using statutorily established methods on an annual basis and are constitutionally required to cover the employer's portion of the normal cost and provide for the amortization of the unfunded accrued liability. Employer contributions are adopted by the Legislature annually upon recommendation of the Public Retirement Systems' Actuarial Committee. In addition, PERS receives a percentage of ad valorem taxes collected by parishes. These entities are not participating employers in the pension system and are considered to be non-employer contributing entities. For the year ended December 31, 2022, the contribution percentages for employees and employers were 9.5% and 11.5%, respectively. The amounts contributed from non-employer contributing entities and from the District Court Judge for the year ended December 31 2022, were \$12,049 and \$113,514, respectively.

#### **Net Pension Asset**

The District Court Judge's net pension asset at December 31, 2022 of \$686,127 is comprised of its proportionate share of the net pension asset relating to the cost-sharing plan. The net pension asset for the plan was measured as of the plan's measurement date, December 31, 2021, and the total pension asset used to calculate the net pension asset was determined by an actuarial valuation as of that date. The District Court Judge's proportionate share of the net pension asset for the plan was based on the District Court Judge's required contributions in proportion to total required contributions for all employers.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Employees hired after January 1, 2007: 30 years age 55, 10 years age 62, 7 years age 67

Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

As of the most recent measurement date, the District Court Judge's proportion for the plan was 0.145661% and the change in proportion from the prior measurement date was a decrease of 0.015617%.

Since the measurement date of the net pension asset was December 31, 2021, for PERS, the net pension asset is based upon fiduciary net position for the plan as of that date. Detailed information about the plan's liabilities, deferred outflows, deferred inflows, and fiduciary net position that was used in the measurement of the District Court Judge's net pension liability is available in the separately issued plan financial report, which may be accessed on their website at <a href="http://www.persla.org">http://www.persla.org</a>.

### **Actuarial Assumptions**

The following table provides information concerning actuarial assumptions used in the determination of the total pension asset for PERS.

Date of experience study on which	1/1/2013 -
significant assumptions are based	12/31/2017
Expected remaining service lives	4
Inflation Rate	2.30%
Projected salary increases	4.75%
Projected benefit changes including COLAs	None
Source of mortality assumptions	PubG-2010 (B) Healthy Retiree Table PubG-2010 (B) Employee Table PubNS-2010 (B) Disabled Retiree Table

Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

#### **Cost of Living Adjustments**

PERS has the authority to grant cost-of-living adjustments (COLAs) on an ad hoc basis. Pursuant to LRS 11:242(B), the power of the Board of Trustees of the PERS to grant a COLA is effective in calendar years that the legislature fails to grant a COLA, unless in the legislation granting a COLA, the legislature authorizes the Board of Trustees to provide an additional COLA. The authority to grant a COLA by the Board is subject to the funded status and interest earnings. The effects of the benefit changes made as a result of the COLAs is included in the measurement of the total pension liability as of the measurement date at which the ad hoc COLA was granted and the amount is known and reasonably estimable.

#### **Discount Rate**

The discount rate used to measure the District Court Judge's total pension asset for the plan and the significant assumptions used in the determination of the discount rate was 6.40%, which remained the same as the prior year. Plan cash flow assumptions are that the plan member contributions will be made at the current contribution rate and sponsor contributions will be made at the actuarially determined rate.

The discount rate used to measure the District Court Judge's total pension liability for the pension plan is equal to the long-term expected rate of return on pension plan investments that are expected to be used to finance the payment of benefits. The rate was determined using a triangulation method which integrated the Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM), a treasury yield curve approach and an equity building block model. Risk return and correlation are projected on a forward-looking basis in equilibrium, in which best-estimates of expected future real rates of return are developed for each major asset class. These rates are combined to produce the long-term expected rate of return by weighting the expected future real rates of return by the target asset allocation percentage and by adding expected inflation and an adjustment for the effect of rebalancing/diversification.

The target allocation and best estimates of arithmetic real rates of return for each major asset class are summarized for the plan in the following table:

		Long-term
		Expected
	Target	Real Rate
Asset Class	Allocation	of Return
Fixed Income	33%	0.85%
Equities	51%	3.23%
Alternative Investments	14%	0.71%
Real Assets	2%	0.11%
Total	100%	4.90%
Inflation		2.10%
Expected Return		7.00%

Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

## Pension Expense and Deferred Outflows of Resources and Deferred Inflows of Resources Related to Pensions:

Changes in the net pension liability may either be reported in pension expense in the year the change occurred or recognized as a deferred outflow of resources or a deferred inflow of resources in the year the change occurred and amortized into pension expense over a number of years. For the year ended December 31, 2022, the District Court Judge recognized a pension benefit of \$151,507 related to the defined benefit plan in which it participates.

At December 31, 2022, the District Court Judge reported deferred outflows of resources and deferred inflows of resources related to pensions from the following sources:

	Deferred Outflows of Resources	Deferred Inflows of Resources
Differences between expected and actual experience	\$ 41,455	\$ 49,728
Changes of assumptions	35,783	-
Net difference between projected and actual earnings on pension plan investments	-	593,488
Change in proportion and differences between employer contributions and proportionate share of contributions	10,277	22,199
Employer contributions subsequent to the		
measurement date	113,514	<u>-</u>
Total	<u>\$ 201,029</u>	<u>\$665,415</u>

Deferred outflows of resources of \$113,514 resulting from the employer contributions subsequent to the measurement date will be recognized as a reduction of the net pension liability during the year ending December 31, 2022. Amounts reported as deferred outflows of resources and deferred inflows of resources related to pensions to be recognized in pension expense are as follows:

	Net Amount
Year Ended	Recognized in
December 31	Pension Expense
2023	\$(120,798)
2024	(240,080)
2025	(153,406)
2026	(63,616)
	<u>\$(577,900)</u>

Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

## Sensitivity of the District Court Judge's Proportional Share of the Net Pension Asset to Changes in the Discount Rate:

The following presents the District Court Judge's proportionate share of the net pension liability of the plan, calculated using the discount rate, as well as what the District Court Judge's proportionate share of the net pension liability would be if they were calculated using a discount rate that is one percentage point lower or one percentage point higher than the current rate:

		Current	
	1%	Discount	1%
	Decrease 5.40%	Rate 6.40%	Increase 7.40%
Net Pension Liability (Asset)	\$ 122,323	\$ (686,127)	\$(1,363,351)

#### **Payables to Pension Plan**

At December 31, 2022, the District Court Judge had no outstanding payables to PERS.

### (8) <u>Court Fees Revenue</u>

The District Court Judge collected court fees during the fiscal year ended December 31, 2022, as follows:

Criminal Bail Bond Fund	\$ 194,172
Iberia Parish	108,409
St. Martin Parish	156,602
St. Mary Parish	94,959
State of Louisiana	699,486
Other	4
Total	\$1,253,632

### (9) Families in Need of Services (FINS) Revenue and Expenditures

The District Court Judge administers the Families in Need of Services Assistance Program, Title VII of the Louisiana Children's Code within the Sixteenth Judicial District. The purpose of the program is to reduce formal juvenile court involvement by generating appropriate community services to benefit children and improve family relations. The District Court Judge receives funds from the State of Louisiana and reimburses the Sixteenth Judicial District Attorney for expenditures incurred for the program. During the fiscal year ended December 31, 2022, the amount received and subsequently reimbursed amounted to \$84,912.

Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

### (10) Risk Management

The District Court Judge is exposed to various risks of loss related to torts; theft of, damage to, and destruction of assets; errors and omissions and natural disasters. The District Court Judge has purchased a commercial crime policy for coverage of loss of funds but has decided to retain the risk of liability exposure for all other risks mentioned above, and presently, does not have any funds appropriated for these potential liability exposures.

### (11) Concentrations of Credit Risk

Intergovernmental receivables represent amounts due from other St. Mary, St. Martin, and Iberia Parishes governmental agencies. Payment of these amounts is partly dependent upon the economic and financial conditions within these parishes.

### (12) Expenditures of the District Court Judge not Included in the Accompanying Financial Statements:

The District Court Judge's offices are located in the courthouses of Iberia, St. Martin, and St. Mary Parishes. The respective parish governments pay for the upkeep and maintenance of the courthouses. The accompanying financial statements do not include certain expenditures of the District Court Judge paid out of the funds of the parish governing bodies or directly by the state.

### (13) <u>Interfund Transfers</u>

	Transfers	Transfers	Transfers
	In	Out	In (Out), Net
General Fund Hearing Officer Fund	\$ 16,667 	\$ (5,260) (16,667)	\$ 11,407 (11,407)
	\$ 21,927	<u>\$ (21,927)</u>	\$ -

Transfers are used to move unrestricted revenues collected in the special revenue funds to finance various programs accounted for in other funds in accordance with budgetary authorizations.

Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

### (14) Appropriation to Criminal Court Fund

The Criminal Court Fund is established by LA.R.S. 15:571.11. This fund received revenues from criminal court costs, fines, and forfeitures. The Criminal Court Fund provides employee salaries and related benefits, and court reporter transcript fees in accordance with an agreement adopted by the District Judges and the District Attorney on January 9, 2001. The District Attorney's Office receives all funds for deposit. Disbursements are made upon the signature of the Chief Judge and the District Attorney. The Criminal Court Fund reimburses the Judges and the District Attorney monthly for employee salary and related benefits expenses, and the Judges for court reporter transcript fees. Any deficit in the fund at year end is shared by the District Attorney's Office and the District Court Judge on a pro-rated basis according to the percentage of total expenditures by each. At December 31, 2022, the District Court Judge's share of the Criminal Court Fund's deficit was \$7,157. This amount is shown as "Due to other governments" on the balance sheet.

### (15) Compensation, Benefits, and Other Payments to Agency Head

Payments from all sources to Lewis H. Pitman, District Court Chief Judge from January 1, 2022, through December 31, 2022 follows:

Purpose:	Amount
Reimbursements - office supplies	\$ 269
Special meals - reimbursement for meal provided for jurors	100
Other - Communications - ZOOM remote	2,506
Total	\$ 2,875

REQUIRED SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

### Budgetary Comparison Schedule General Fund For the Year Ended December 31, 2022

	Original Budget	Final Budget	Actual	Variance - Positive (Negative)
Revenues:	<b>4.60.000</b>	<b>404000</b>	<b></b>	<b>.</b>
Fees and fines	\$ 469,000	\$ 484,000	\$ 552,856	\$ 68,856
State grants	84,072	84,912	84,912	-
Parish government's reimbursements	48,043	54,889	54,884	(5)
Interest	450	5,000	10,435	5,435
Other	1,006	1,004	3,841	2,837
Total revenues	602,571	629,805	706,928	77,123
Expenditures:				
Current -				
Public safety:				
Salaries and related benefits	207,740	193,067	191,518	1,549
Operating services	73,135	73,570	52,758	20,812
Professional fees	37,040	43,640	35,586	8,054
Materials and supplies	65,550	67,405	60,823	6,582
Travel and other charges	68,170	70,785	41,096	29,689
Appropriation to District Attorney - FINS	84,072	84,912	84,912	-
Appropriation to Criminal Court Fund	73,716	19,849	7,157	12,692
Capital outlay	26,900	27,300	12,083	15,217
Total expenditures	636,323	580,528	485,933	94,595
Excess (deficiency) of revenues				
over expenditures	(33,752)	49,277	220,995	171,718
Other financing sources (uses):				
Transfers in	480	7,500	16,667	9,167
Transfers out	(4,500)	(4,500)	(5,260)	(760)
Total other financing sources (uses)	(4,020)	3,000	11,407	8,407
Net change in fund balance	(37,772)	52,277	232,402	180,125
Fund balance, beginning	1,307,285	1,307,285	1,307,285	
Fund balance, ending	\$1,269,513	\$1,359,562	\$1,539,687	\$ 180,125

### Budgetary Comparison Schedule Hearing Officer Fund For the Year Ended December 31, 2022

	Original Budget	Final Budget	Actual	Variance - Positive (Negative)
Revenues:	Φ	Φ (0(0 <b>7</b> 0	Φ (00 40 (	Ф. 12 (16
Fees and fines	\$ 660,000	\$ 686,870	\$ 699,486	\$ 12,616
Interest	480	7,500	16,667	9,167
Total revenues	660,480	694,370	716,153	21,783
Expenditures:				
Current -				
Public safety:				
Salaries and related benefits	601,318	583,402	580,734	2,668
Operating services	21,615	23,466	19,520	3,946
Professional fees	22,360	23,560	22,445	1,115
Materials and supplies	16,150	16,150	12,039	4,111
Travel and other charges	14,920	13,720	10,330	3,390
Capital outlay	8,100	9,300	4,675	4,625
Total expenditures	684,463	669,598	649,743	19,855
Excess (deficiency) of revenues				
over expenditures	(23,983)	24,772	66,410	41,638
Other financing sources (uses):				
Transfer in	4,500	4,500	5,260	760
Transfers out	(480)	(7,500)	(16,667)	(9,167)
Total other financing sources (uses)	4,020	(3,000)	(11,407)	(8,407)
Net change in fund balance	(19,963)	21,772	55,003	33,231
Fund balance, beginning	1,639,644	1,639,644	1,639,644	
Fund balance, ending	\$1,619,681	\$1,661,416	\$1,694,647	\$ 33,231

### Budgetary Comparison Schedule St. Mary Parish Drug Court Testing Fund For the Year Ended December 31, 2022

	Original Budget	Final Budget	Actual	Variance - Positive (Negative)		
Revenues:			f 1 200			
Fees and fines Interest	\$ 200 5	\$ 1,100 86	\$ 1,290 195	\$ 190 109		
Total revenues	205	1,186	1,485	299		
Expenditures: Current - Public safety:						
Travel and other charges	900	951	51	900		
Net change in fund balance	(695)	235	1,434	1,199		
Fund balance, beginning	19,309	19,309	19,309	<del>_</del>		
Fund balance, ending	\$ 18,614	\$ 19,544	\$ 20,743	\$ 1,199		

### Schedule of Changes in Net OPEB Liability and Related Ratios For the Year Ended December 31, 2022

### **Total OPEB Liability**

Service cost	\$	232,369
Interest		66,833
Effect of economic/demographic gains or losses		856,791
Changes in assumptions		(449,443)
Benefit payments and net transfers		(81,320)
Net Changes		625,230
Total OPEB liability - beginning		3,052,406
Total OPEB liability - ending	\$ 3	3,677,636
Covered employee payroll	\$	1,057,150
Total OPEB liability as a percentage of covered-employee payroll		347.88%

### Schedule of Employer's Share of Net Pension Liability (Asset) For the Year Ended December 31, 2022

Plan Fiscal Year	Plan	Employer Proportion of the Net Pension Liability (Asset)	Employer Proportionate Share of the Net Pension Liability (Asset)	Employer's Covered Employee Payroll	Employer's Proportionate Share of the Net Pension Liability (Asset) as a Percentage of its Covered Employee Payroll	Plan Fiduciary Net Position as a Percentage of the Total Pension Liability
12/31/2021	PERS	0.145661%	\$(696,127)	\$ 977,298	-71.2%	110.46%
12/31/2020	PERS	0.161278%	(282,787)	1,077,184	-26.3%	104.00%
12/31/2019	PERS	0.185582%	8,736	1,176,739	0.7%	99.89%
12/31/2018	PERS	0.193863%	860,434	1,189,026	72.4%	88.86%
12/31/2017	PERS	0.183845%	(136,458)	1,131,600	-12.1%	101.98%
12/31/2016	PERS	0.188998%	302,068	1,120,862	26.9%	94.15%
12/31/2015	PERS	0.192212%	505,957	1,102,069	45.9%	92.23%
12/31/2014	PERS	0.193523%	52,911	1,092,125	4.80%	99.15%

This schedule is intended to show information for 10 years. Additional years will be displayed as they become available.

### Schedule of Employer Contributions For the Year Ended December 31, 2022

For the Year Ended December 31,	Plan	Contractually Required Contribution	Contributions in Relation to Contractually Required Contribution	Contribution Deficiency (Excess)	Employer's Covered Employee Payroll	Contributions as a % of Covered Employee Payroll
2022	PERS	\$ 113,514	\$113,514	\$ -	\$ 987,083	11.50%
2021	PERS	119,719	119,719	-	977,298	12.25%
2020	PERS	131,955	131,955	-	1,077,184	12.25%
2019	PERS	135,325	135,325	-	1,176,739	11.50%
2018	PERS	136,738	136,738	-	1,189,026	11.50%
2017	PERS	141,450	141,450	-	1,131,600	12.50%
2016	PERS	145,712	145,712	-	1,120,862	13.00%
2015	PERS	159,800	159,800	-	1,102,069	14.50%

### Notes to Required Supplementary Information

### (1) Budgets

The District Court Judge prepares and adopts a budget in accordance with R.S. 39:1301 et seq. The proposed budget for the year ended December 31, 2022, was made available for public inspection for a two-week period prior to the public hearing (and also at the public hearing) held at the Iberia Parish Courthouse on December 10, 2021. The proposed budget was formally adopted by the District Court Judge at this time. All appropriations lapse at year-end. The budget is prepared on a modified accrual basis, consistent with the basis of accounting, for comparability of budget and actual revenues and expenditures. Formal budgetary accounts are integrated into the accounting system during the year as a management control device. The District Court Judge is authorized to transfer amounts between line items within each fund. When actual revenues within the General Fund are failing to meet estimated annual budgeted revenues by five percent or more and/or actual expenditures within the General Fund are failing to meet estimated annual budgeted revenues by five percent or more, a budget amendment to reflect such change is adopted by the District Court Judge. Budgeted amounts included in the accompanying financial statements include the original budget amounts and all subsequent amendments.

### (2) Pension Plan

Changes of assumptions about future economic or demographic factors or of other outputs were recognized in pension expense using the straight-line amortization method over a closed period equal to the average of the expected remaining service lives of all employees that were provided with pensions through the pension plan. These assumptions include the rate of investment return, mortality of plan members, rate of salary increase, rates of retirement, rates of termination, rates of disability, and various other factors that have an impact on the cost of the plan.

#### (3) Other Postemployment Benefit Plan

Benefit Changes – There were no changes in benefit terms for the year ended December 31, 2022.

Changes of Assumptions – The discount rate increased from 2.06% to 3.72% for the year ended December 31, 2022.

There are no assets accumulated in a trust that meets the criteria of GASB codification P22.101 or P52.101 to pay related benefits for the OPEB plan.

OTHER SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

# SIXTEENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT-DISTRICT JUDGE LLA Entity ID #8736

### Justice System Funding Schedule - Receiving Entity Judicial Expense Fund (General Fund)

For the Year Ended December 31, 2022

Cash Basis Presentation	First Six Month Period Ended 06/30/22	Second Six Month Period Ended 12/31/22
Receipts From: (Must include one agency name and one collection type - see below - on each line and may require multiple lines for the same agency. Additional rows may be added as necessary.)		
Iberia Parish Sheriff, Commission on Bail Bond Premium	45,309	35,305
St. Martin Parish Sheriff, Commission on Bail Bond Premium	22,253	28,611
St. Mary Parish Sheriff, Commission on Bail Bond Premium	44,006	25,149
Iberia Parish Clerk of Court, Civil Fees	29,805	25,542
St. Martin Parish Clerk of Court, Civil Fees	22,635	21,574
St. Mary Parish Clerk of Court, Civil Fees	17,113	17,952
Iberia Parish Sheriff, Criminal Court Costs/Fees	26,588	23,479
St. Martin Parish Sheriff, Criminal Court Costs/Fees	50,518	54,675
St. Mary Parish Sheriff, Criminal Court Costs/Fees	24,325	30,047
Sixteenth Judicial District Attorney, Criminal Court Costs/Fees	4,553	4,476
Louisiana Fee Collection, Criminal Court Costs/Fees	2,570	1,068
State of Louisiana Department of Public Safety & Corrections, Criminal Court Costs/Fees	350	
Agency name/collection type		-
Subtotal Receipts	290,025	267,878
Ending Balance of Amounts Assessed but Not Received (only applies to those agencies that assess on behalf of themselves, such as courts)	-	-

# SIXTEENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT-DISTRICT JUDGE LLA Entity ID #8736

### Justice System Funding Schedule - Receiving Entity Hearing Officer Fund

For the Year Ended December 31, 2022

Cash Basis Presentation	First Six Month Period Ended 06/30/22	Second Six Month Period Ended 12/31/22
Receipts From: (Must include one agency name and one collection type - see below - on each line and may require multiple lines for the same agency. Additional rows may be added as necessary.)		
State of Louisiana Dept. of Social Services, Crininal Court Cost/Fees	353,507	351,747
Agency name/collection type		
Subtotal Receipts	353,507	351,747
Ending Balance of Amounts Assessed but Not Received (only applies		
to those agencies that assess on behalf of themselves, such as courts)	-	=

# SIXTEENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT-DISTRICT JUDGE LLA Entity ID #8736

### Justice System Funding Schedule - Receiving Entity St. Mary Drug Court Testing Fund

For the Year Ended December 31, 2022

Cash Basis Presentation	First Six Month Period Ended 06/30/22	Second Six Month Period Ended 12/31/22
Receipts From: (Must include one agency name and one collection type - see below - on each line and may require multiple lines for the same agency. Additional rows may be added as necessary.)		
Sixteenth Judicial District Attorney, Criminal Court Costs/Fees	800	490
Agency name/collection type		
Subtotal Receipts	800	490
Ending Balance of Amounts Assessed but Not Received (only applies to those agencies that assess on behalf of themselves, such as courts)	-	-

### Budgetary Comparison Schedule General Fund

### For the Year Ended December 31, 2022 With Comparative Actual Amounts for the Year Ended December 31, 2021

				202	22					
	Original Budget		Final Budget		Actual		Variance - Positive (Negative)		2021 Actual	
Revenues:		4.60.000		404.000		0				
Fees and fines	\$	469,000	\$	484,000	\$	552,856	\$	68,856	\$	555,859
State grants		84,072		84,912		84,912		-		113,854
Parish government's reimbursements		48,043		54,889		54,884		(5)		64,382
Interest		450		5,000		10,435		5,435		501
Other		1,006		1,004	_	3,841		2,837		2,123
Total revenues		602,571		629,805	_	706,928		77,123	_	736,719
Expenditures:										
Current -										
Public safety:										
Salaries and related benefits		207,740		193,067		191,518		1,549		165,640
Operating services		73,135		73,570		52,758		20,812		49,360
Professional fees		37,040		43,640		35,586		8,054		28,098
Materials and supplies		65,550		67,405		60,823		6,582		61,871
Travel and other charges		68,170		70,785		41,096		29,689		34,747
Appropriation to District Attorney - FINS		84,072		84,912		84,912		-		84,072
Appropriation to Criminal Court Fund		73,716		19,849		7,157		12,692		5,921
Capital outlay		26,900		27,300		12,083		15,217		17,052
Total expenditures		636,323		580,528	_	485,933		94,595		446,761
Excess (deficiency) of revenues										
over expenditures		(33,752)		49,277		220,995		171,718		289,958
Other financing sources (uses):										
Transfers in		480		7,500		16,667		9,167		682
Transfers out		(4,500)		(4,500)		(5,260)		(760)		(5,596)
Total other financing sources (uses)		(4,020)		3,000		11,407		8,407		(4,914)
Net change in fund balance		(37,772)		52,277		232,402		180,125		285,044
Fund balance, beginning	1	,307,285		1,307,285		1,307,285				1,022,241
Fund balance, ending	\$ 1	,269,513	\$	1,359,562	\$	1,539,687	\$	180,125	\$	1,307,285

### Budgetary Comparison Schedule Hearing Officer Fund

### For the Year Ended December 31, 2022 With Comparative Actual Amounts for the Year Ended December 31, 2021

	Original Budget	Final Budget	Actual	Variance - Positive (Negative)	2021 Actual
Revenues:		<b>.</b>			<b>.</b>
Fees and fines	\$ 660,000	\$ 686,870	\$ 699,486	\$ 12,616	\$ 683,878
Interest	480	7,500	16,667	9,167	682
Total revenues	660,480	694,370	716,153	21,783	684,560
Expenditures:					
Current -					
Public safety:					
Salaries and related benefits	601,318	583,402	580,734	2,668	531,425
Operating services	21,615	23,466	19,520	3,946	18,546
Professional fees	22,360	23,560	22,445	1,115	19,895
Materials and supplies	16,150	16,150	12,039	4,111	17,123
Travel and other charges	14,920	13,720	10,330	3,390	7,377
Capital outlay	8,100	9,300	4,675	4,625	1,374
Total expenditures	684,463	669,598	649,743	19,855	595,740
Excess (deficiency) of revenues					
over expenditures	(23,983)	24,772	66,410	41,638	88,820
Other financing sources (uses):					
Transfer in	4,500	4,500	5,260	760	5,596
Transfers out	(480)	(7,500)	(16,667)	(9,167)	(682)
Total other financing sources (uses)	4,020	(3,000)	(11,407)	(8,407)	4,914
Net change in fund balance	(19,963)	21,772	55,003	33,231	93,734
Fund balance, beginning	1,639,644	1,639,644	1,639,644		1,545,910
Fund balance, ending	\$1,619,681	\$1,661,416	\$ 1,694,647	\$ 33,231	\$1,639,644

## SIXTEENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT-DISTRICT JUDGE

Parishes of Iberia, St. Martin and St. Mary

Budgetary Comparison Schedule St. Mary Parish Drug Court Testing Fund

### For the Year Ended December 31, 2022 With Comparative Actual Amounts for the Year Ended December 31, 2021

	Original Budget	Final Budget	Actual	Variance - Positive (Negative)	2021 Actual
Revenues:				·	
Fees and fines	\$ 200	\$ 1,100	\$ 1,290	\$ 190	\$ 1,530
Interest	5	86	195	109	5
Total revenues	205	1,186	1,485	299	1,535
Expenditures:					
Current -					
Public safety:					
Travel and other charges	900	951	51	900	
Net change in fund balance	(695)	235	1,434	1,199	1,535
Fund balance, beginning	19,309	19,309	19,309		17,774
Fund balance, ending	\$ 18,614	\$ 19,544	\$ 20,743	\$ 1,199	\$ 19,309

INTERNAL CONTROL, COMPLIANCE AND OTHER MATTERS

### **KOLDER, SLAVEN & COMPANY, LLC**

CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

Brad E. Kolder, CPA, JD\*
Gerald A. Thibodeaux, Jr., CPA\*
Robert S. Carter, CPA\*
Arthur R. Mixon, CPA\*
Stephen J. Anderson, CPA\*
Matthew E. Margaglio, CPA\*
Casey L. Ardoin, CPA, CFE\*
Wanda F. Arcement, CPA
Bryan K. Joubert, CPA
Nicholas Fowlkes, CPA
Deidre L. Stock, CPA

C. Burton Kolder, CPA\*
Of Counsel

Victor R. Slaven, CPA\* - retired 2020 Christine C. Doucet, CPA – retired 2022

\* A Professional Accounting Corporation

183 S. Beadle Rd. Lafayette, LA 70508 Phone (337) 232-4141

1 Phone (225) 293-8300 450 E. Main St.

1428 Metro Dr. Alexandria, LA 71301 Phone (318) 442-4421

New Iberia, LA 70560 Phone (337) 367-9204

11929 Bricksome Ave.

Baton Rouge, LA 70816

200 S. Main St. Abbeville, LA 70510 Phone (337) 893-7944 1201 David Dr. Morgan City, LA 70380 Phone (985) 384-2020

434 E. Main St. Ville Platte, LA 70586 Phone (337) 363-2792 332 W. Sixth Ave. Oberlin, LA 70655 Phone (337) 639-4737

WWW.KCSRCPAS.COM

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

To the Honorable Judges of the Sixteenth Judicial District Court-District Judge Parishes of Iberia, St. Martin and St. Mary, Louisiana New Iberia, Louisiana

We have audited, in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by Comptroller General of the United States, the financial statements of the governmental activities, each major fund, and the aggregate remaining fund information of the Sixteenth Judicial District Court-District Judge (District Court Judge) as of and for the year ended December 31, 2022, and the related notes to the financial statements, which collectively comprise the District Court Judge's basic financial statements and have issued our report thereon dated May 25, 2023.

#### **Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting**

In planning and performing our audit, we considered the District Court Judge'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 District Court Judge's internal control. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the District Court Judge'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 entity's financial statements will not be prevented or detected and corrected on a timely basis. A significant deficiency is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control that is less severe than a material weakness, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance.

Our consideration of internal control was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control that might be material weaknesses or, significant deficiencies. 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 or significant deficiencies may exist that were not identified.

### **Report on Compliance and Other Matters**

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the District Court Judge'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 results of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on the effectiveness of the entity's internal control or on compliance. This report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* in considering the entity's internal control and compliance. Accordingly, this communication is not suitable for any other purpose. Under Louisiana Revised Statute 24:513, this report is distributed by the Louisiana Legislative Auditor as a public document.

Kolder, Slaven & Company, LLC
Certified Public Accountants

New Iberia, Louisiana May 25, 2023.

# Summary Schedule of Current and Prior Year Findings and Management's Corrective Action Plan

### Part I. Current Year Findings and Management's Corrective Action Plan

A. Internal Control Findings -

There were no internal control findings.

B. Compliance Findings

There were no compliance findings.

### Part II. Prior Year Findings

A. Internal Control Findings -

There were no internal control findings.

B. Compliance Findings -

There were no compliance findings.

### SIXTEENTH (16<sup>th</sup>) JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT – DISTRICT JUDGE

New Iberia, Louisiana

Agreed-Upon Procedures Report

Year Ended December 31, 2022

## **KOLDER, SLAVEN & COMPANY, LLC**

CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

Brad E. Kolder, CPA, JD\*
Gerald A. Thibodeaux, Jr., CPA\*
Robert S. Carter, CPA\*
Arthur R. Mixon, CPA\*
Stephen J. Anderson, CPA\*
Matthew E. Margaglio, CPA\*
Casey L. Ardoin, CPA, CFE\*
Wanda F. Arcement, CPA
Bryan K. Joubert, CPA
Nicholas Fowlkes, CPA
Deidre L. Stock, CPA

C. Burton Kolder, CPA\*
Of Counsel

Victor R. Slaven, CPA\* - retired 2020 Christine C. Doucet, CPA - retired 2022

\* A Professional Accounting Corporation

183 S. Beadle Rd. Lafayette, LA 70508 Phone (337) 232-4141

Baton Rouge, LA 70816 41 Phone (225) 293-8300 450 E. Main St.

1428 Metro Dr. Alexandria, LA 71301 Phone (318) 442-4421

New Iberia, LA 70560 Phone (337) 367-9204

11929 Bricksome Ave.

200 S. Main St. Abbeville, LA 70510 Phone (337) 893-7944 1201 David Dr. Morgan City, LA 70380 Phone (985) 384-2020

434 E. Main St. Ville Platte, LA 70586 Phone (337) 363-2792 332 W. Sixth Ave. Oberlin, LA 70655 Phone (337) 639-4737

WWW.KCSRCPAS.COM

### INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANT'S REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

To the Honorable Judges of the Sixteenth Judicial District Court – District Judge Parishes of Iberia, St. Martin, and St. Mary, Louisiana New Iberia, Louisiana and the Louisiana Legislative Auditor

We have performed the procedures enumerated below on the control and compliance (C/C) areas identified in the Louisiana Legislative Auditor's (LLA's) Statewide Agreed-Upon Procedures (SAUPs) for the fiscal period January 1, 2022 through December 31, 2022. The Sixteenth Judicial District Court – District Judge's management is responsible for those C/C areas identified in the SAUPs.

The Sixteenth Judicial District Court – District Judge (District Court Judge) has agreed to and acknowledged that the procedures performed are appropriate to meet the intended purpose of the engagement, which is to perform specified procedures on the C/C areas identified in LLA's SAUPs for the fiscal period January 1, 2022 through December 31, 2022. Additionally, LLA has agreed to and acknowledged that the procedures performed are appropriate for its purposes. This report may not be suitable for any other purpose. The procedures performed may not address all the items of interest to a user of this report and may not meet the needs of all users of this report and, as such, users are responsible for determining whether the procedures performed are appropriate for their purposes.

The procedures and associated findings are as follows:

### Written Policies and Procedures

- 1. We obtained and inspected the District Court Judge's written policies and procedures and observed that they address each of the following categories and subcategories if applicable to public funds and the District Court Judge's operations:
  - a) Budgeting, including preparing, adopting, monitoring, and amending the budget.
  - b) **Purchasing**, including (1) how purchases are initiated; (2) how vendors are added to the vendor list; (3) the preparation and approval process of purchase requisitions and purchase orders; (4) controls to ensure compliance with the Public Bid Law; and (5) documentation required to be maintained for all bids and price quotes.
  - c) *Disbursements*, including processing, reviewing, and approving.
  - d) **Receipts/Collections**, including receiving, recording, and preparing deposits. Also, policies and procedures should include management's actions to determine the completeness of all collections for each type of revenue or agency fund additions (e.g., periodic confirmation with outside parties,

- reconciliation to utility billing after cutoff procedures, reconciliation of traffic ticket number sequences, agency fund forfeiture monies confirmation).
- e) *Payroll/Personnel*, including (1) payroll processing, (2) reviewing and approving time and attendance records, including leave and overtime worked, and (3) approval process for employee rates of pay or approval and maintenance of pay rate schedules.
- f) *Contracting*, including (1) types of services requiring written contracts, (2) standard terms and conditions, (3) legal review, (4) approval process, and (5) monitoring process.
- g) *Travel and Expense Reimbursement*, including (1) allowable expenses, (2) dollar thresholds by category of expense, (3) documentation requirements, and (4) required approvers.
- h) Credit Cards (and debit cards, fuel cards, purchase cards, if applicable), including (1) how cards are to be controlled, (2) allowable business uses, (3) documentation requirements, (4) required approvers of statements, and (5) monitoring card usage (e.g., determining the reasonableness of fuel card purchases).
- i) *Ethics*, including (1) the prohibitions as defined in Louisiana Revised Statute 42:1111-1121, (2) actions to be taken if an ethics violation takes place, (3) system to monitor possible ethics violations, and (4) a requirement that documentation is maintained to demonstrate that all employees and officials were notified of any changes to the entity's ethics policy.
- j) **Debt Service**, including (1) debt issuance approval, (2) continuing disclosure/EMMA reporting requirements, (3) debt reserve requirements, and (4) debt service requirements.
- k) Information Technology Disaster Recovery/Business Continuity, including (1) identification of critical data and frequency of data backups, (2) storage of backups in separate physical location isolated from the network, (3) periodic testing/verification that backups can be restored, (4) use of antivirus software on all systems, (5) timely application of all available system and software patches/updates, and (6) identification of personnel, processes, and tools needed to recover operations after a critical event.
- 1) *Prevention of Sexual Harassment*, including R.S. 42:342-344 requirements for (1) agency responsibilities and prohibitions, (2) annual employee training, and (3) annual reporting.

#### **Board or Finance Committee**

- 2. We obtained and inspected the board/finance committee minutes for the fiscal period, as well as the board's enabling legislation, charter, bylaws, or equivalent document in effect during the fiscal period, and:
  - a) Observed that the board/finance committee met with a quorum at least monthly, or on a frequency in accordance with the board's enabling legislation, charter, bylaws, or other equivalent document.
  - b) Observed that the minutes referenced or included monthly budget-to-actual comparisons on the General Fund, quarterly budget-to-actual, at a minimum, on proprietary funds, and semi-annual budget-to-actual, at a minimum, on all special revenue funds.
  - c) Obtained the prior year audit report and observed the unassigned fund balance in the General Fund. If the General Fund had a negative ending unassigned fund balance in the prior year audit report, observed that the minutes for at least one meeting during the fiscal period referenced or included a formal plan to eliminate the negative unrestricted fund balance in the General Fund.
  - d) Observed whether the board/finance committee received written updates of the progress of resolving audit finding(s), according to management's corrective action plan at each meeting until the finding are considered fully resolved.

#### **Bank Reconciliations**

- 3. We obtained a listing of the District Court Judge's bank accounts for the fiscal period from management and management's representation that the listing is complete. We asked management to identify the District Court Judge's main operating account. We selected the District Court Judge's main operating account and randomly selected 4 additional accounts (or all accounts if less than 5). We randomly selected one month from the fiscal period, obtained and inspected the corresponding bank statement and reconciliation for selected accounts, and observed that:
  - a) Bank reconciliations included evidence that they were prepared within 2 months of the related statement closing date (e.g., initialed and dated, electronically logged);
  - b) Bank reconciliations included evidence that a member of management/board member who does not handle cash, post ledgers, or issue checks has reviewed each bank reconciliation (e.g., initialed and dated, electronically logged); and
  - c) Management has documentation reflecting that it has researched reconciling items that have been outstanding for more than 12 months from the statement closing date, if applicable.

### Collections (excluding electronic fund transfers)

- 4. We obtained a listing of deposit sites for the fiscal period where deposits for cash/checks/money orders (cash) are prepared and management's representation that the listing is complete. We randomly selected 5 deposit sites (or all deposit sites if less than 5).
- 5. For each deposit site selected, we obtained a listing of collection locations and management's representation that the listing is complete. We randomly selected one collection location for each deposit site (e.g., 5 collection locations for 5 deposit sites), obtained and inspected written policies and procedures relating to employee job duties (if no written policies or procedures, inquired of employees about their job duties) at each collection location, and observed that job duties are properly segregated at each collection location such that:
  - a) Employees that are responsible for cash collections do not share cash drawers/registers;
  - b) Each employee responsible for collecting cash is not responsible for preparing/making bank deposits, unless another employee/official is responsible for reconciling collection documentation (e.g., pre-numbered receipts) to the deposit;
  - c) Each employee responsible for collecting cash is not also responsible for posting collection entries to the general ledger or subsidiary ledgers, unless another employee/official is responsible for reconciling ledger postings to each other and to the deposit; and
  - d) The employee(s) responsible for reconciling cash collections to the general ledger and/or subsidiary ledgers, by revenue source and/or agency fund additions, is (are) not responsible for collecting cash, unless another employee verifies the reconciliation.
- 6. We obtained from management a copy of the bond or insurance policy for theft covering all employees who have access to cash. We observed the bond or insurance policy for theft was enforced during the fiscal period.
- 7. We randomly selected two deposit dates for each of the 5 bank accounts selected for procedure #3 under "Bank Reconciliations" above (selected the next deposit date chronologically if no deposits were made on the dates randomly selected and randomly selected a deposit if multiple deposits are made on the same day). Alternately, the practitioner may use a source document other than bank statements when selecting the deposit dates for testing, such as a cash collection log, daily revenue report, receipt book, etc. We obtained supporting documentation for each of the 10 deposits and:
  - a) Observed that receipts are sequentially pre-numbered.

- b) Traced sequentially pre-numbered receipts, system reports, and other related collection documentation to the deposit slip.
- c) Traced the deposit slip total to the actual deposit per the bank statement.
- d) Observed that the deposit was made within one business day of receipt at the collection location (within one week if the depository is more than 10 miles from the collection location or the deposit is less than \$100 and the cash is stored securely in a locked safe or drawer).
- e) Traced the actual deposit per the bank statement to the general ledger.

# Non-Payroll Disbursements (excluding card purchases, travel reimbursements, and petty cash purchases)

- 8. We obtained a listing of locations that process payments for the fiscal period and management's representation that the listing was complete. We randomly selected 5 locations (or all locations if less than 5).
- 9. For each location selected under #8 above, we obtained a listing of those employees involved with non-payroll purchasing and payment functions. We obtained written policies and procedures relating to employee job duties (if the agency has no written policies and procedures, inquire of employees about their job duties), and we observed that job duties are properly segregated such that:
  - a) At least two employees are involved in initiating a purchase request, approving a purchase, and placing an order/making the purchase;
  - b) At least two employees are involved in processing and approving payments to vendors;
  - c) The employee responsible for processing payments is prohibited from adding/modifying vendor files, unless another employee is responsible for periodically reviewing changes to vendor files;
  - d) Either the employee/official responsible for signing checks mails the payment or gives the signed checks to an employee to mail who is not responsible for processing payments; and
  - e) Only employees/officials authorized to sign checks approve the electronic disbursement (release) of funds, whether through automated clearinghouse (ACH), electronic funds transfer (EFT), wire transfer, or some other electronic means.
- 10. For each location selected under #8 above, we obtained the District Court Judge's non-payroll disbursement transaction population (excluding cards and travel reimbursements) and we obtained management's representation that the population is complete. We randomly selected 5 disbursements for each location, we obtained supporting documentation for each transaction and:
  - a) We observed whether the disbursement, whether by paper or electronic means, matched the related original itemized invoice and supporting documentation indicated deliverables included on the invoice were received by the entity, and
  - b) We observed that the disbursement documentation includes evidence (e.g., initial/date, electronic logging) of segregation of duties tested under #9, as applicable.
- 11. Using the entity's main operating account and the month selected in Bank Reconciliations procedure #3 above, we selected 5 non-payroll-related electronic disbursements (or all electronic disbursements if less than 5), and observed that each electronic disbursement was:
  - a) Approved by only those persons authorized to disburse funds (e.g., sign checks) per the entity's policy, and

b) Approved by the required number of authorized signers per the entity's policy. Note: If no electronic payments were made from the main operating account during the month selected, we selected an alternative month and/or account for testing that did include electronic disbursements.

#### Credit Cards/Debit Cards/Fuel Cards/P-Cards

### (The District Court Judge does not have credit cards; therefore, this procedure is not applicable.)

- 12. We obtained from management a listing of all active credit cards, bank debit cards, fuel cards, and purchase cards (cards) for the fiscal period, including the card numbers and the names of the persons who maintained possession of the cards. We obtained management's representation that the listing is complete.
- 13. Using the listing prepared by management, we randomly selected 5 cards (or all cards if less than 5) that were used during the fiscal period. We randomly selected one monthly statement or combined statement for each card (for a debit card, we randomly selected one monthly bank statement), we obtained supporting documentation, and:
  - a) We observed that there is evidence that the monthly statement or combined statement and supporting documentation (e.g., original receipts for credit/debit card purchases, exception reports for excessive fuel card usage) was reviewed and approved, in writing (or electronically approved), by someone other than the authorized card holder.
  - b) We observed that finance charges and late fees were not assessed on the selected statements.
- 14. Using the monthly statements or combined statements selected under #12 above, excluding fuel cards, we randomly selected 10 transactions (or all transactions if less than 10) from each statement, and obtain supporting documentation for the transactions (i.e. each card should have 10 transactions subject to testing). For each transaction, we observed that it is supported by (1) an original itemized receipt that identifies precisely what was purchased, (2) written documentation of the business/public purpose, and (3) documentation of the individuals participating in meals (for meal charges only). For missing receipts, we described the nature of the transaction and noted whether management had a compensating control to address missing receipts, such as a "missing receipt statement" that is subject to increased scrutiny.

#### Travel and Travel-Related Expense Reimbursements (excluding card transactions)

- 15. We obtained from management a listing of all travel and travel-related expense reimbursements during the fiscal period and management's representation that the listing or general ledger is complete. We randomly selected 5 reimbursements, we obtained the related expense reimbursement forms/prepaid expense documentation of each selected reimbursement, as well as the supporting documentation. For each of the 5 reimbursements selected:
  - a) If reimbursed using a per diem, we observed the approved reimbursement rate is no more than those rates established either by the State of Louisiana or the U.S. General Services Administration (www.gsa.gov);
  - b) If reimbursed using actual costs, we observed that the reimbursement is supported by an original itemized receipt that identifies precisely what was purchased;
  - c) We observed that each reimbursement is supported by documentation of the business/public purpose (for meal charges, we observed that the documentation includes the names of those individuals participating) and other documentation required by written policy (procedure #1g).

d) We observed that each reimbursement was reviewed and approved, in writing, by someone other than the person receiving reimbursement.

#### **Contracts**

- 16. We obtained from management a listing of all agreements/contracts for professional services, materials and supplies, leases, and construction activities that were initiated or renewed during the fiscal period. We obtained management's representation that the listing is complete. We randomly selected 5 contracts (or all contracts if less than 5) from the listing, excluding the practitioner's contract, and:
  - a) We observed that the contract was bid in accordance with the Louisiana Public Bid Law (e.g., solicited quotes or bids, advertised), if required by law;
  - b) We observed that the contract was approved by the governing body/board, if required by policy or law (e.g., Lawrason Act, Home Rule Charter);
  - c) If the contract was amended (e.g., change order), we observed that the original contract terms provided for such an amendment and that amendments were made in compliance with the contract terms (e.g., if approval is required for any amendment, was approval documented);
  - d) We randomly selected one payment from the fiscal period for each of the 5 contracts, we obtained the supporting invoice, agreed the invoice to the contract terms, and observed that the invoice and related payment agreed to the terms and conditions of the contract.

### Payroll and Personnel

- 17. We obtained a listing of employees/elected officials employed during the fiscal period and management's representation that the listing is complete. We randomly selected 5 employees or officials, we obtained related paid salaries and personnel files, and we agreed paid salaries to authorized salaries/pay rates in the personnel files.
- 18. We randomly selected one pay period during the fiscal period. For the 5 employees or officials selected under #17 above, we obtained attendance records and leave documentation for the pay period, and:
  - a) We observed that all selected employees or officials documented their daily attendance and leave (e.g., vacation, sick, compensatory). (Note: Generally, an elected official is not eligible to earn leave and does not document his/her attendance and leave. However, if the elected official is earning leave according to policy and/or contract, the official should document his/her daily attendance and leave.)
  - b) We observed that supervisors approved the attendance and leave of the selected employees or officials;
  - c) We observed that any leave accrued or taken during the pay period is reflected in the District Court Judge's cumulative leave records; and
  - d) We observed the rate paid to the employees or officials agree to the authorized salary/pay rate found within the personnel file.
- 19. We obtained a listing of those employees or officials that received termination payments during the fiscal period and management's representation that the list is complete. We randomly selected two employees or officials, we obtained related documentation of the hours and pay rates used in management's termination payment calculations and the District Court Judge's policy on termination payments. We agreed the hours to the employee or officials' cumulate leave records, agreed the pay

- rates to the employee or officials' authorized pay rates in the employee or officials' personnel files, and agreed the termination payment to entity policy.
- 20. We obtained management's representation that employer and employee portions of third-party payroll related amounts (e.g., payroll taxes, retirement contributions, health insurance premiums, garnishments, workers' compensation premiums, etc.) have been paid, and any associated forms have been filed, by required deadlines.

#### **Ethics**

- 21. Using the 5 randomly selected employees/officials from procedure #17 under "Payroll and Personnel" above, we obtained ethics documentation from management, and:
  - a) We observed that the documentation demonstrates each employee/official completed one hour of ethics training during the calendar year as required by R.S. 42:1170; and.
  - b) We observed whether the entity maintains documentation which demonstrates each employee and official were notified of any changes to the entity's ethics policy during the fiscal period, as applicable.
- 22. We inquired and observed whether the agency has appointed an ethics designee as required by R.S. 42:1170.

#### Debt Service

## (The District Court Judge did not issue any debt or have outstanding debt during the fiscal period; therefore, this procedure is not applicable.)

- 23. Obtain a listing of bonds/notes and other debt instruments issued during the fiscal period and management's representation that the listing is complete. Select all debt instruments on the listing, obtain supporting documentation, and observe State Bond Commission approval was obtained for each debt instrument issued as required by Article VII. Section 8 of the Louisiana Constitution.
- 24. Obtain a listing of bonds/notes outstanding at the end of the fiscal period and management's representation that the listing is complete. Randomly select one bond/note, inspect debt covenants, obtain supporting documentation for the reserve balance and payments, and agree actual reserve balances and payments to those required by debt covenants (including contingency funds, short-lived asset funds, or other funds required by the debt covenants).

### Fraud Notice

- 25. We obtained a listing of misappropriations of public funds and assets during the fiscal period and management's representation that the listing was complete. We selected all misappropriations on the listing, obtained supporting documentation, and observed that the District Court Judge reported the misappropriation(s) to the legislative auditor and the district attorney of the parish in which the District Court Judge is domiciled as required by R.S. 24:523.
- 26. We observed that the District Court Judge has posted on its premises and website, the notice required by R.S. 24:523.1 concerning the reporting of misappropriation, fraud, waste, or abuse of public funds.

### Information Technology Disaster Recovery/Business Continuity

27. We performed the following procedures,

a) We obtained and inspected the entity's most recent documentation that it has backed up its critical data (if no written documentation, inquire of personnel responsible for backing up critical data) and observed that such backup: 1) occurred within the past week, 2) was not stored on the government's local server or network, and 3) was encrypted.

### We performed the above procedure and discussed the results with management.

b) We obtained and inspected the entity's most recent documentation that it has tested/verified that its backups can be restored (if no written documentation, inquire of personnel responsible for testing/verifying backup restoration) and observed evidence that the test/verification was successfully performed within the past 3 months.

### We performed the above procedure and discussed the results with management.

c) We obtained a listing of the entity's computers currently in use and their related locations, and management's representation that the listing is complete. We randomly selected 5 computers and observed while management demonstrates that the selected computers have current and active antivirus software and that the operating system and accounting system software in use are currently supported by the vendor.

### We performed the above procedure and discussed the results with management.

28. We randomly selected all 5 terminated employees (or all terminated employees if less than 5) using the list of terminated employees obtained in procedure #19. We observed evidence that the selected terminated employees have been removed or disabled from the network.

### Prevention of Sexual Harassment

- 29. Using the 5 randomly selected employees or officials from procedure #17 under "Payroll and Personnel" above, we obtained sexual harassment training documentation from management, and observed the documentation demonstrates each employee or official completed at least one hour of sexual harassment training during the calendar year as required by R.S. 42:343.
- 30. We observed the entity has posted its sexual harassment policy and complaint procedure on its website (or in a conspicuous location on the entity's premises if the entity does not have a website).
- 31. We obtained the entity's annual sexual harassment report for the current fiscal period, observed that the report was dated on or before February 1, and observed it includes the applicable requirements of R.S. 42:344:
  - a) Number and percentage of public servants in the agency who have completed the training requirements:
  - b) Number of sexual harassment complaints received by the agency;
  - c) Number of complaints which resulted in a finding that sexual harassment occurred;
  - d) Number of complaints in which the finding of sexual harassment resulted in discipline or corrective action; and
  - e) Amount of time it took to resolve each complaint.

### **Exceptions:**

No exceptions were found as a result of applying the procedures listed above.

We were engaged by the District Court Judge to perform this agreed-upon procedures engagement and conducted our engagement in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants and applicable standards of *Government Auditing Standards*. We were not engaged to and did not conduct an examination or review engagement, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion or conclusion, respectively, on those C/C areas identified in the SAUPs. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion or conclusion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

We are required to be independent of the District Court Judge and to meet our other ethical responsibilities, in accordance with the relevant ethical requirements related to our agreed-upon procedures engagement.

This report is intended solely to describe the scope of testing performed on those C/C areas identified in the SAUPs, and the result of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on control or compliance. Accordingly, this report is not suitable for any other purpose. Under Louisiana Revised Statute 24:513, this report is distributed by the LLA as a public document.

Kolder, Slaven & Company, LLC
Certified Public Accountants

New Iberia, Louisiana May 25, 2023