



**INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT
ON COMPLIANCE AND ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER COMPLIANCE
WITH THE REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO PROPOSITION A
AND PROPOSITION C ORDINANCES AND PROPOSITION A
AND PROPOSITION C LOCAL RETURN GUIDELINES**

**TO THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY
METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2023**

**INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT
ON COMPLIANCE AND ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER COMPLIANCE
WITH THE REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO PROPOSITION A
AND PROPOSITION C ORDINANCES AND PROPOSITION A
AND PROPOSITION C LOCAL RETURN GUIDELINES**

**TO THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY
METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**

FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2023

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds
Consolidated Audit Report
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2023**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT ON COMPLIANCE AND ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER COMPLIANCE APPLICABLE TO PROPOSITION A AND PROPOSITION C ORDINANCES AND PROPOSITION A AND PROPOSITON C LOCAL RETURN GUIDELINES	1
List of Package A Jurisdictions	5
Compliance Area Tested	6
Summary of Audit Results	
Schedule 1 – Summary of Compliance Findings	7
Schedule 2 – Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs	8



655 N. Central Avenue
Suite 1550
Glendale, CA 91203

www.vasquez.cpa

213-873-1700
OFFICE

LOS ANGELES
SAN DIEGO
IRVINE
SACRAMENTO
FRESNO
PHOENIX
LAS VEGAS
MANILA, PH

**INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT
ON COMPLIANCE AND ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER COMPLIANCE
WITH THE REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO PROPOSITION A
AND PROPOSITION C ORDINANCES AND PROPOSITION A AND PROPOSITION C
LOCAL RETURN GUIDELINES**

**To the Board of Directors of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
and Proposition A and Proposition C Independent Citizen's Advisory and Oversight
Committee**

Report on Compliance

Opinion

We have audited the compliance of the County of Los Angeles (County) and the thirty-nine (39) Cities identified in the List of Package A Jurisdictions, with the types of compliance requirements described in the Proposition A and Proposition C Ordinances enacted through a Los Angeles County voter-approved law in November 1980 and November 1990, respectively; Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Guidelines, issued by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro), approved by its Board of Directors in FY 2006-07 (collectively, the Guidelines); and the respective Assurances and Understandings Regarding Receipt and Use of Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds, executed by Metro, the County and the respective Cities for the year ended June 30, 2023 (collectively, the Requirements). Compliance with the aforementioned Guidelines and Requirements by the County and the Cities are identified in the accompanying Summary of Audit Results, Schedule 1 and Schedule 2.

In our opinion, the County and the Cities complied, in all material respects, with the Guidelines and the Requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on the Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return programs for the year ended June 30, 2023.

Basis for Opinion

We conducted our audit of compliance in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America (GAAS); the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States (*Government Auditing Standards*); and the Guidelines. Our responsibilities under those standards and the Guidelines are further described in the Auditor's Responsibilities for the Audit of Compliance section of our report.



We are required to be independent of the County and the Cities and to meet our other ethical responsibilities, in accordance with 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 opinion on compliance with the Guidelines. Our audit does not provide a legal determination of the County's and the Cities' compliance with the compliance requirements referred to above.

Responsibilities of Management for Compliance

Management is responsible for the County's and the Cities' compliance with the Guidelines and for the design, implementation, and maintenance of effective internal control over compliance with the requirements of laws, statutes, regulations, rules, and provisions of contracts or agreements applicable to the County and each City's Proposition A Local Return program and Proposition C Local Return program.

Auditor's Responsibilities for the Audit of Compliance

Our objectives are to obtain reasonable assurance about whether material noncompliance with the compliance requirements referred to above occurred, whether due to fraud or error, and express an opinion on the County's and the Cities' compliance based on our audit. 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 GAAS, *Government Auditing Standards*, and the Guidelines will always detect material noncompliance when it exists. The risk of not detecting material noncompliance resulting from fraud is higher than for that resulting from error, as fraud may involve collusion, forgery, intentional omissions, misrepresentations, or the override of internal control. Noncompliance with the compliance requirements referred to above is considered material, if there is a substantial likelihood that, individually or in the aggregate, it would influence the judgment made by a reasonable user of the report on compliance about the County's and the Cities' compliance with the requirements of the Guidelines as a whole.

In performing an audit in accordance with GAAS, *Government Auditing Standards*, and the Guidelines, we:

- Exercise professional judgment and maintain professional skepticism throughout the audit.
- Identify and assess the risks of material noncompliance, 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 County's and the Cities' compliance with the compliance requirements referred to above and performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.
- Obtain an understanding of the County's and the Cities' internal control over compliance relevant to the audit in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances and to test and report on internal control over compliance in accordance with the Guidelines, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the County's and the Cities' internal control over compliance. Accordingly, no such opinion is expressed.

We are required to communicate with those charged with governance regarding, among other matters, the planned scope and timing of the audit and any significant deficiencies and material weaknesses in internal control over compliance that we identified during the audit.



Other Matters

The results of our auditing procedures disclosed instances of noncompliance which are required to be reported in accordance with the Guidelines and the Requirements and which are described in the accompanying Summary of Compliance Findings (Schedule 1) and Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs (Schedule 2) as Findings #2023-001 through #2023-013. Our opinion is not modified with respect to these matters.

Government Auditing Standards require the auditor to perform limited procedures on the Cities' responses to the noncompliance findings identified in our compliance audits described in the accompanying Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs (Schedule 2). The Cities' responses were not subjected to the other auditing procedures applied in the audit of compliance and, accordingly, we express no opinion on the responses.

Report on Internal Control Over Compliance

Our consideration of internal control over compliance was for the limited purpose described in the Auditor's Responsibilities for the Audit of Compliance section above and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control over compliance that might be material weaknesses or significant deficiencies in internal control over compliance and therefore, material weaknesses or significant deficiencies may exist that were not identified. However, as discussed below, we did identify certain deficiencies in internal control over compliance that we consider to be a material weakness and a significant deficiency.

A deficiency in internal control over compliance exists when the design or operation of a control over compliance does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct, noncompliance with the Guidelines on a timely basis. *A material weakness in internal control over compliance* is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control over compliance, such that there is a reasonable possibility that material noncompliance with the Guidelines will not be prevented, or detected and corrected, on a timely basis. We consider the deficiency in internal control over compliance described in the accompanying Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs (Schedule 2) as Finding #2023-008 to be a material weakness.

A significant deficiency in internal control over compliance is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control over compliance with the Guidelines that is less severe than a material weakness in internal control over compliance, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance. We consider the deficiency in internal control over compliance described in the accompanying Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs (Schedule 2) as Finding #2023-009 to be a significant deficiency.

Our audit was not designed for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of internal control over compliance. Accordingly, no such opinion is expressed.

Government Auditing Standards requires the auditor to perform limited procedures on the Cities' responses to the internal control over compliance findings identified in our compliance audits described in the accompanying Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs (Schedule 2). The Cities' responses were not subjected to the other auditing procedures applied in the audit of compliance and, accordingly, we express no opinion on the responses.



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

Vasquez & Company LLP

Glendale, California
December 29, 2023

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds
List of Package A Jurisdictions
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2023**

1. COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
2. CITY OF AGOURA HILLS
3. CITY OF AZUSA
4. CITY OF BALDWIN PARK
5. CITY OF BELL
6. CITY OF BELL GARDENS
7. CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS
8. CITY OF CALABASAS
9. CITY OF CARSON
10. CITY OF COMMERCE
11. CITY OF COMPTON
12. CITY OF CUDAHY
13. CITY OF CULVER CITY
14. CITY OF EL MONTE
15. CITY OF GARDENA
16. CITY OF HAWTHORNE
17. CITY OF HIDDEN HILLS
18. CITY OF HUNTINGTON PARK
19. CITY OF INDUSTRY
20. CITY OF INGLEWOOD
21. CITY OF IRWINDALE
22. CITY OF LA PUENTE
23. CITY OF LAWNSDALE
24. CITY OF LYNWOOD
25. CITY OF MALIBU
26. CITY OF MAYWOOD
27. CITY OF MONTEBELLO
28. CITY OF MONTEREY PARK
29. CITY OF PICO RIVERA
30. CITY OF POMONA
31. CITY OF ROSEMEAD
32. CITY OF SAN FERNANDO
33. CITY OF SANTA FE SPRINGS
34. CITY OF SANTA MONICA
35. CITY OF SOUTH EL MONTE
36. CITY OF SOUTH GATE
37. CITY OF VERNON
38. CITY OF WALNUT
39. CITY OF WEST HOLLYWOOD
40. CITY OF WESTLAKE VILLAGE

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds
Compliance Area Tested
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2023

1. Uses the State Controller's Uniform System of Accounts and Records or has established a separate Proposition A and Proposition C Local Transit Assistance Account for local return purposes.
2. Revenues received including allocations, project generated revenues and interest income was properly credited to the Proposition A and/or Proposition C Local Return Account.
3. Funds were expended with Metro's approval and were not substituted for property tax.
4. Timely use of funds.
5. Administrative expenses are within the 20% cap.
6. Expenditures that exceeded 25% of approved project budget have approved amended Project Description Form (Form A) or electronic equivalent.
7. Annual Project Update Report (Form B) or electronic equivalent was submitted on time.
8. Annual Expenditure Report (Form C) or electronic equivalent was submitted on time.
9. Pavement Management System (PMS) is in place and being used for Street Maintenance or Improvement Projects Expenditures.
10. Local Return Account is credited for reimbursable expenditures.
11. Where Proposition A funds were given, loaned or exchanged by one jurisdiction to another, the receiving jurisdiction has credited its Local Return Account with the funds received.
12. Self-Certification was completed and submitted for Intelligent Transportation Systems projects and elements.
13. A separate account was established for Capital reserve funds, Capital reserve was approved by Metro and current status is reported in the Annual Project Update (Form B) or electronic equivalent.
14. Recreational transit form was submitted on time.
15. Fund exchanges (trades, loans, or gifts) were approved by Metro.
16. Proposition C Local Return Funds were used to augment, not supplant existing local revenues being used for road improvement purposes.
17. All on-going and carryover projects were reported on Form B or electronic equivalent.
18. Cash or cash equivalents are maintained.
19. Accounting procedures, record keeping and documentation are adequate.

SUMMARY OF AUDIT RESULTS

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds
Summary of Compliance Findings
Fiscal Year ended June 30, 2023**

The audits of the County of Los Angeles and the 39 cities have resulted in 13 findings. The table below summarizes those findings:

Finding	# of Findings	Responsible Cities/ Finding No. Reference	Questioned Costs		Resolved During the Audit
			PALRF	PCLRF	
Funds were expended with Metro's approval and were not substituted for property tax.	3	Baldwin Park (See Finding #2023-002)	\$ -	\$ 117,370	\$ 117,370
		Huntington Park (See Finding #2023-005)	7,674	-	7,674
		Lynwood (See Finding #2023-010)	-	63,062	63,062
Timely use of funds.	2	Lawndale (See Finding #2023-009)	162,361	-	162,361
		Malibu (See Finding #2023-013)	7,220	-	7,220
Expenditures that exceeded 25% of approved project budget have approved amended Project Description Form (Form A) or electronic equivalent.	3	Baldwin Park (See Finding #2023-003)	None	None	None
		Huntington Park (See Finding #2023-006)	None	None	None
		Lynwood (See Finding #2023-0011)	None	-	None
Annual Expenditure Report (Form C) or electronic equivalent was submitted on time.	2	Calabasas (See Finding #2023-004)	None	None	None
		Lynwood (See Finding #2023-0012)	None	None	None
Pavement Management System (PMS) is in place and being used for Street Maintenance or Improvement Projects Expenditures.	1	Azuza (See Finding #2023-001)	-	None	None
Recreational transit form was submitted on time.	1	Huntington Park (See Finding #2023-007)	None	-	None
Accounting procedures, record keeping and documentation are adequate.	1	Huntington Park (See Finding #2023-008)	None	None	None
Total Findings and Questioned Costs	13		\$ 177,255	\$ 180,432	\$ 357,687

Details of the above findings are in Schedule 2.

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2023**

Finding #2023-001: PCLRF	City of Azusa
Compliance Reference	<p>Section II (C)(7) Pavement Management Systems (PMS) of the Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Guidelines states that, "Jurisdictions are required to certify that they have conducted and maintain Pavement Management Systems (PMS) when proposing "Street Repair and Maintenance" or "Bikeway projects".</p> <p>"Self-certifications executed by the jurisdiction's Engineer or designated, registered civil engineer, must be submitted with Form A for new street maintenance or bikeway projects, or Form B (biannually) for ongoing projects, to satisfy "Street Repair and Maintenance" and "Bikeway" project eligibility criteria."</p> <p>"A Pavement Management System (PMS) Certification Form should be prepared and submitted to Metro with project codes 705, 710, 806, and 840."</p>
Condition	<p>The City did not submit a current Pavement Management System (PMS) certification during FY 2022/23. A PMS assessment and inventory is required to be conducted and maintained every 3 years. The City's latest certification submitted to Metro on June 29, 2021 has a September 2019 inventory update and review of pavement condition completion date which was already over three years as of June 30, 2023.</p> <p>A PMS Certification is required for the following PCLRF Project code 705, Foothill Boulevard Street Improvements project.</p>
Cause	There was a turnover in permanent staff and a turnover in consultants.
Effect	The City was not in compliance with respect to the certification of PMS in conformance with the criteria stipulated in the Local Return Guidelines. As such, any local return funds spent on the projects may be required to be returned to the Local Return Funds.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2023
(Continued)

Finding #2023-001: PCLRF (Continued)	City of Azusa
Recommendation	We recommend that the City submit to Metro and keep on file an updated PMS certification for eligibility for its new or ongoing street maintenance or bikeway projects.
Management's Response	The City completed its Pavement Management System inventory and assessment on November 8, 2023. The current PMS certification was submitted to Metro on December 14, 2023.
Finding Corrected During the Audit	The City submitted the current PMS certification to Metro Program Manager on December 14, 2023. No follow-up is required.

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2023
(Continued)**

Finding #2023-002: PCLRF	City of Baldwin Park
Compliance Reference	Section I(C) Project Description Form (Form A) of the Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Guidelines states that "Jurisdictions shall submit for approval a Project Description Form (Form A) or its electronic equivalent prior to the expenditure of funds for 1) a new project; 2) a new route; 3) a 25 percent change (increase or decrease) in route or revenue vehicle miles for an established LR funded transit service; 4) a 0.75 miles or greater service change that duplicates/overlays an existing transit service; or 5) a 25 percent or greater change in an approved LR project budget or scope on all operating or capital LR projects."
Condition	<p>The City claimed expenditures under the following projects prior to approval from Metro.</p> <p>a. Project code 105, Fixed Route Service, totaling \$57,524; and</p> <p>b. Project code 107, Dial-A-Ride Service, totaling \$59,846.</p> <p>Although we found the expenditures to be eligible for Local Return funding, these projects had no prior approval from Metro.</p>
Cause	The City did not anticipate incurring eligible expenditures for these projects. The City was not able to submit a budget request for Metro's approval until after June 30, 2023.
Effect	The City claimed expenditures totaling \$117,370 of Proposition C LR funds prior to approval by Metro. The City did not comply with the Guidelines.
Recommendation	We recommend the City establish procedures and internal controls to ensure that approval is obtained from Metro prior to spending on Local Return-funded projects.
Management's Response	The City submitted a Budget Request to the Metro Program Manager and obtained retroactive approval of the budgets for said projects on October 18, 2023.
Finding Corrected During the Audit	Metro Program Manager granted retroactive approval of the said projects on October 18, 2023. No additional follow-up is required.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2023
(Continued)

Finding #2023-003: PALRF and PCLRF	City of Baldwin Park
Compliance Reference	Section I(C) Project Description Form (Form A) of the Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Guidelines states that "Jurisdictions shall submit for approval a Project Description Form (Form A) or its electronic equivalent prior to the expenditure of funds for 1) a new project; 2) a new route; 3) a 25 percent change (increase or decrease) in route or revenue vehicle miles for an established LR funded transit service; 4) a 0.75 miles or greater service change that duplicates/overlays an existing transit service; or 5) a 25 percent or greater change in an approved LR project budget or scope on all operating or capital LR projects."
Condition	<p>The City exceeded Metro's approved budget by more than 25 percent prior to obtaining approval through a revised Form A or a Budget Request via LRMS for the following projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. PALRF's Project code 170, Bus Shelter Maintenance. Amount in excess of 25 percent of the approved budget was \$3,039; b. PALRF's Project code 215, CNG Station. Amount in excess of 25 percent of the approved budget was \$36,463; and c. PCLRF's Project code 705, Street Name/Roadway Signs. The amount in excess of 25 percent of the approved budget was \$3,603. <p>Projects with greater than 25 percent change from the approved project budget should be amended by submitting a Project Description Form (Form A) or a Budget Request via LRMS.</p> <p>The City submitted the Budget Requests through LRMS and obtained retroactive approval of the project from the Metro Program Manager.</p>
Cause	The City did not anticipate incurring eligible expenditures for more than the approved budget for these projects. The City was not able to submit a request to increase the budget for Metro's approval until after June 30, 2023.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2023
(Continued)

Finding #2023-003: PALRF and PCLRF (Continued)	City of Baldwin Park
Effect	The City's PALRF and PCLRF project expenditures exceeded 25 percent of the approved project budgets prior to Metro's approval which resulted in the City's noncompliance with the Guidelines.
Recommendation	We recommend the City submit revised Form A's or submit Budget Requests via LRMS to obtain Metro's approval for the change in project budgets and implement internal controls to ensure compliance with this requirement at all times.
Management's Response	The City agrees with the findings and will submit revised budgets via LRMS prior to the end of the fiscal year to obtain Metro's approval for the change in the project budget and implement internal controls to ensure compliance with this requirement at all times. The City submitted a Budget Request to the Metro Program Manager and obtained retroactive approval of the budgets for said projects on October 18, 2023.
Finding Corrected During the Audit	Metro Program Manager granted retroactive approval of the said projects on October 18, 2023. No additional follow-up is required.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2023
(Continued)

Finding #2023-004: PALRF and PCLRF	City of Calabasas
Compliance Reference	Section I(C) Annual Expenditure Report (Actuals Entry) of the Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Guidelines state that, "Jurisdiction shall submit on or before October 15 th of each fiscal year an Annual Expenditure Report (Actuals Entry) to provide an update on previous year LR fund receipts and expenditures."
Condition	The City submitted its Annual Expenditure Report (Actuals Entry) to Metro on November 2, 2023, 18 days after the due date of October 15, 2023.
Cause	The City inadvertently missed the filing deadline.
Effect	The City's Annual Expenditure Report (Actuals Entry) was not submitted timely. The City was not in compliance with the reporting requirements of the Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Guidelines.
Recommendation	We recommend the City establish procedures and internal controls to ensure that the Annual Expenditure Report (Actuals Entry) is submitted by October 15 th as required by the Guidelines.
Management's Response	The City will ensure the Proposition A and C Actuals Entry is submitted in a timely manner by October 15 th of each fiscal year.
Finding Corrected During the Audit	The City subsequently submitted the Annual Expenditure Report (Actuals Entry) on November 2, 2023. No additional follow-up is required.

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2023
(Continued)**

Finding #2023-005: PALRF	City of Huntington Park
Compliance Reference	Section I(C) Project Description Form (Form A) of the Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Guidelines states that "Jurisdictions shall submit for approval a Project Description Form (Form A) or its electronic equivalent prior to the expenditure of funds for 1) a new project; 2) a new route; 3) a 25 percent change (increase or decrease) in route or revenue vehicle miles for an established LR funded transit service; 4) a 0.75 miles or greater service change that duplicates/overlays an existing transit service; or 5) a 25 percent or greater change in an approved LR project budget or scope on all operating or capital LR projects."
Condition	<p>The City claimed expenditures under Project Code 155, Special Event Transit, totaling \$7,674 prior to approval from Metro.</p> <p>Although we found the expenditures to be eligible for Local Return funding, this project had no prior approval from Metro.</p>
Cause	The City did not anticipate incurring eligible expenditures for this project. The City was not able to submit a budget request for Metro's approval until after June 30, 2023.
Effect	The City claimed expenditures totaling \$7,674 of Proposition A LR funds prior to approval by Metro. The City did not comply with the Guidelines.
Recommendation	We recommend the City establish procedures and internal controls to ensure that approval is obtained from Metro prior to spending on a Local Return-funded project.
Management's Response	The City submitted a Budget Request to the Metro Program Manager and obtained retroactive approval of the budget for said project on December 12, 2023.
Finding Corrected During the Audit	Metro Program Manager granted retroactive approval of the said project on December 12, 2023. No additional follow-up is required.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2023
(Continued)

Finding #2023-006: PALRF and PCLRF	City of Huntington Park
Compliance Reference	Section I(C) Project Description Form (Form A) of the Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Guidelines states that "Jurisdictions shall submit for approval a Project Description Form (Form A) or its electronic equivalent prior to the expenditure of funds for 1) a new project; 2) a new route; 3) a 25 percent change (increase or decrease) in route or revenue vehicle miles for an established LR funded transit service; 4) a 0.75 miles or greater service change that duplicates/overlays an existing transit service; or 5) a 25 percent or greater change in an approved LR project budget or scope on all operating or capital LR projects."
Condition	<p>The City exceeded Metro's approved budget by more than 25 percent prior to obtaining approval through a revised Form A or a Budget Request for the following projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. PALRF's Project code 105, Fuel for Fixed Route and Dial-A-Ride. Amount in excess of 25 percent of the approved budget was \$188; and b. PCLRF's Project code 107, Fuel for Fixed Route and Dial-A-Ride. The amount in excess of 25 percent of the approved budget was \$63. <p>Projects with greater than 25 percent change from the approved project budget should be amended by submitting a Project Description Form (Form A) or a Budget Request via LRMS.</p> <p>The City submitted the Budget Requests through LRMS and obtained retroactive approval of the project from the Metro Program Manager.</p>
Cause	The City did not anticipate incurring eligible expenditures more than the approved budget for these projects. The City was not able to submit a request to increase the budget for Metro's approval until after June 30, 2023.
Effect	The City's PALRF and PCLRF project expenditures exceeded 25 percent of the approved project budgets prior to Metro's approval which resulted in the City's noncompliance with the Guidelines.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2023
(Continued)

Finding #2023-006: PALRF and PCLRF (Continued)	City of Huntington Park
Recommendation	We recommend the City submit revised Form A's or submit Budget Requests via LRMS to obtain Metro's approval for the change in project budgets and implement internal controls to ensure compliance with this requirement at all times.
Management's Response	The City agrees with the findings and will submit revised budgets via LRMS prior to the end of the fiscal year to obtain Metro's approval for the change in the project budget and implement internal controls to ensure compliance with this requirement at all times. The City submitted a Budget Request to the Metro Program Manager and obtained retroactive approval of the budgets for said projects on December 12, 2023.
Finding Corrected During the Audit	Metro Program Manager granted retroactive approval of the said projects on December 12, 2023. No additional follow-up is required.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2023
(Continued)

Finding #2023-007: PALRF	City of Huntington Park
Compliance Reference	Section III(A) Reporting Requirements for Jurisdictions, Annual Expenditure Report (Form C or Actuals Entry) of the Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Guidelines states that, "For Jurisdictions with Recreational Transit projects, Jurisdictions are required to annually submit an accounting of Recreational Transit trips, destinations and costs. This information should be submitted along with the Form C or Actuals Entry, no later than October 15 after the fiscal year".
Condition	The City submitted its Recreational Transit Certification on November 29, 2023, 45 days after the due date of October 15, 2023.
Cause	The City inadvertently missed the filing deadline.
Effect	The City was not in compliance with the reporting requirements of the Local Return Guidelines.
Recommendation	We recommend the City establish procedures and internal controls to ensure that the Recreational Transit Certification is submitted by October 15 th as required by the Guidelines.
Management's Response	The City will ensure the Recreational Transit Certification is submitted in a timely manner by October 15 th for each fiscal year.
Finding Corrected During the Audit	The City subsequently submitted the Recreational Transit Certification. No follow-up is required.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2023
(Continued)

Finding #2023-008: PALRF	City of Huntington Park
Compliance Reference	Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Guidelines Section V, state that, "It is the jurisdictions' responsibility to maintain proper accounting records and documentation to facilitate the performance of the audit as prescribed in these Guidelines".
Condition	<p>As of the date of audit fieldwork, the City's year-end closing process is still ongoing. We noted the following observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconciliation of major balance sheet accounts including bank accounts was not yet completed. • Cut-off procedures relating to year-end accruals were inadequate to ensure the recording of transactions in the proper period. This resulted in the City's adjustments which affected the prior period's account balances. • Beginning fund balances were not reconciled with the prior year's audited reports. <p>Accordingly, the audits of the City's financial statements for fiscal years 2022 and 2023 have not yet started because of the clean-up and closing process currently being done.</p>
Cause	During the fiscal years 2021 through 2023, the City lost several key employees, particularly in the Finance and Accounting Department. As such, there were delays in the closing of the City's books for the fiscal year 2023 and prior years. Currently, the accounting personnel and support staff are working towards closing the books and providing the closing entries, trial balances, schedules, reconciliations, account analysis, and other financial reports needed by management and the auditors.
Effect	The City was not in compliance with the audit requirements of the Local Return Guidelines.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2023
(Continued)

Finding #2023-008: PALRF (Continued)	City of Huntington Park
Recommendation	We recommend the City implement a monthly and year-end closing process in a timely manner. We also recommend that the City establish and document proper closing and reconciliation procedures and assign responsibility for completing the procedures to specific City personnel. The closing procedures should be documented in a checklist that indicates who will perform each procedure and when completion of each procedure is due and is accomplished. The timing of specific procedures could be coordinated with the timing of management's or the auditor's need for the information. These reconciliations will provide assurance that financial statements are complete and accurate.
Management's Response	The City is in the process of catching up on all accounting processes that have not been completed due to staff turnover and various other reasons. The new management team in the Finance and Accounting Department is putting procedures in place to ensure monthly and annual year-end closing processes are well documented and occur on time.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2023
(Continued)

Finding #2023-009: PALRF	City of Lawndale
Compliance Reference	Section I(B) Timely Use of Funds of Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Guidelines states that "Jurisdictions have three years to expend LR funds. Funds must be expended within three years of the last day of the fiscal year in which funds were originally allocated. Therefore, by the method of calculation, each Jurisdiction has the Fiscal Year of allocation plus three years to expend Proposition A and/or Proposition C funds."
Condition	The City has unused Proposition A funds amounting to \$162,361 which lapsed as of June 30, 2023. This is a repeat finding from prior year.
Cause	The Lawndale Beat bus service did not start until May/June 2023 as the contract was being approved. Due to the unexpected late start of this project, funds were not spent as expected.
Effect	The City did not comply with the Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Guidelines.
Recommendation	We recommend the City establish procedures and internal controls to ensure that Proposition A funds are used timely.
Management's Response	The City expects to use up the Proposition A funds during FY 2023/24 now that the Lawndale Beat bus service is up and running. The City requested and obtained an extension for the use of the funds from the LA Metro Program Manager.
Finding Corrected During the Audit	On December 14, 2023, Metro Transportation Planning Manager granted an extension for the use of the lapsed funds on or by June 30, 2024. No additional follow-up is required.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2023
(Continued)

Finding #2023-0010: PCLRF	City of Lynwood
Compliance Reference	Section I(C) Project Description Form (Form A) of the Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Guidelines states that "Jurisdictions shall submit for approval a Project Description Form (Form A) or its electronic equivalent prior to the expenditure of funds for 1) a new project; 2) a new route; 3) a 25 percent change (increase or decrease) in route or revenue vehicle miles for an established LR funded transit service; 4) a 0.75 miles or greater service change that duplicates/overlays an existing transit service; or 5) a 25 percent or greater change in an approved LR project budget or scope on all operating or capital LR projects."
Condition	<p>The City claimed expenditures under Proposition C prior to approval from Metro for the following projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Project code 780, Administration and Monitoring, totaling \$3,776; b. Project code 805, ATP Cycle 2 Linkage to CC, totaling \$3,040; and c. Project code 805, Bike Trail Extension (Design and Construction), totaling \$56,246. <p>Although we found the expenditures to be eligible for Local Return funding, these projects had no prior approval from Metro.</p>
Cause	The City did not anticipate incurring eligible expenditures for these projects. The City was not able to submit a budget request for Metro's approval until after June 30, 2023.
Effect	The City claimed expenditures totaling \$63,062 of Proposition C funds prior to approval by Metro. The City did not comply with the Guidelines.
Recommendation	We recommend that the City establish procedures and internal controls to ensure that approval is obtained from Metro prior to spending on Local Return-funded projects.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2023
(Continued)

Finding #2023-010: PCLRF (Continued)	City of Lynwood
Management's Response	The City submitted a Budget Request to the Metro Program Manager and obtained retroactive approval of the budgets for said projects on December 18, 2023.
Finding Corrected During the Audit	Metro Program Manager granted retroactive approval of the said projects on December 18, 2023. No additional follow-up is required.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2023
(Continued)

Finding #2023-011: PALRF	City of Lynwood
Compliance Reference	Section I(C) Project Description Form (Form A) of the Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Guidelines states that "Jurisdictions shall submit for approval a Project Description Form (Form A) or its electronic equivalent prior to the expenditure of funds for: 1) a new project; 2) a new route; 3) a 25 percent change (increase or decrease) in route or revenue vehicle miles for an established LR funded transit service; 4) a 0.75 miles or greater service change that duplicates/overlays an existing transit service; or 5) a 25 percent or greater change in an approved LR project budget or scope on all operating or capital LR projects."
Condition	<p>The City exceeded Metro's approved budget by more than 25 percent prior to obtaining approval through a revised Form A or Budget Request via LRMS for the PALRF Project code 105, Fixed Bus Route. The amount in excess of 25 percent of the approved budget was \$50,788.</p> <p>Projects with greater than 25 percent change from the approved project budget should be amended by submitting a Project Description Form (Form A) or a Budget Request via LRMS.</p> <p>The City submitted the Budget Requests through LRMS and obtained retroactive approval of the project from the Metro Program Manager.</p>
Cause	The City was in transition staff-wise. Information was not properly communicated.
Effect	The City's PALRF project expenditures exceeded 25 percent of the approved project budget prior to Metro's approval which resulted in the City's noncompliance with the Guidelines.
Recommendation	We recommend the City submit revised Form A's or submit Budget Requests via LRMS to obtain Metro's approval for the change in project budgets and implement internal controls to ensure compliance with this requirement at all times.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2023
(Continued)

Finding #2023-011: PALRF (Continued)	City of Lynwood
Management's Response	The City agrees with the finding and will submit revised budgets via SmartSheets prior to the end of the fiscal year to obtain Metro's approval for the change in project budget and implement internal controls to ensure compliance with this requirement at all times. The City submitted a Budget Request to the Metro Program Manager and obtained retroactive approval of the budgets for said project on December 18, 2023.
Finding Corrected During the Audit	Metro Program Manager granted retroactive approval of the said project on December 18, 2023. No additional follow-up is required.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2023
(Continued)

Finding #2023-012: PALRF and PCLRF	City of Lynwood
Compliance Reference	Section I (C) Annual Expenditure Report (Actuals Entry) of the Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Guidelines state that, "Jurisdiction shall submit on or before October 15 th of each fiscal year an Annual Expenditure Report (Actuals Entry) to provide an update on previous year LR fund receipts and expenditures."
Condition	The City submitted its Annual Expenditure Report (Actuals Entry) to Metro on October 23, 2023, 8 days after the due date of October 15, 2023.
Cause	The City inadvertently missed the filing deadline.
Effect	The City's Annual Expenditure Report (Actuals Entry) was not submitted timely. The City was not in compliance with the reporting requirements of the Local Return Guidelines.
Recommendation	We recommend the City establish procedures and internal controls to ensure that the Annual Expenditure Report (Actuals Entry) is submitted by October 15 th as required by the Guidelines.
Management's Response	The City will ensure the Proposition A & C Actuals Entry is submitted in a timely manner by October 15 th of each fiscal year.
Finding Corrected During the Audit	The City subsequently submitted the Annual Expenditure Report (Actuals Entry) on October 23, 2023. No additional follow-up is required.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2023
(Continued)

Finding #2023-013: PALRF	City of Malibu
Compliance Reference	Section I (B) Timely Use of Funds of Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Guidelines state that, "Metro will enforce regulations to ensure the timely use of LR funds. Under the Proposition A and Proposition C Ordinances, Jurisdictions have three years to expend LR funds. Funds must be expended within three years of the last day of the fiscal year in which funds were originally allocated. Therefore, by the method of calculation, each Jurisdiction has the Fiscal Year of allocation plus three years to expend Proposition A and/or Proposition C funds."
Condition	The City has unused Proposition A funds amounting to \$7,220 which has lapsed as of June 30, 2023.
Cause	The City's projects were delayed and did not have enough expenditures to cover the lapsing amount.
Effect	The City did not comply with the Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Guidelines.
Recommendation	We recommend the City establish procedures and internal controls to ensure that Proposition A funds are used timely.
Management's Response	The City has requested Metro to extend the use of the remaining \$7,220 Proposition A funds through June 30, 2024, since the City has existing approved projects in FY 2023/24. On October 18, 2023, the City received Metro's approval for the extension of the use of funds until June 30, 2024.
Finding Corrected During the Audit	On October 18, 2023, Metro Transportation Planning Manager granted an extension for the use of the lapsed funds on or by June 30, 2024. No additional follow-up is required.



www.vasquezcpa.com

Vasquez & Company LLP has 50 years of experience in performing audit, accounting & consulting services for all types of nonprofit organizations, for-profit companies, governmental entities and publicly traded companies. Vasquez is a member of the RSM US Alliance. RSM US Alliance provides its members with access to resources of RSM US LLP. RSM US Alliance member firms are separate and independent businesses and legal entities that are responsible for their own acts and omissions, and each are separate and independent from RSM US LLP. RSM US LLP is the U.S. member firm of RSM International, a global network of independent audit, tax, and consulting firms. Members of RSM US Alliance have access to RSM International resources through RSM US LLP but are not member firms of RSM International. Visit rsmus.com/about-us for more information regarding RSM US LLP and RSM International. The RSM™ logo is used under license by RSM US LLP. RSM US Alliance products and services are proprietary to RSM US LLP.