



LOS ANGELES COUNTY
METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT
OPERATIONS AGENCY

50% EXPENDITURE LIMITATION SCHEDULE

FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2025

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT
OPERATIONS AGENCY

Table of Contents

	Page
Independent Auditor's Report on Compliance with the California Code of Regulations (Section 6667); Report on Internal Control over Compliance; and Report on 50% Expenditure Limitation Schedule	1
50% Expenditure Limitation Schedule	4



INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT ON COMPLIANCE WITH THE CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS (SECTION 6667); REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER COMPLIANCE; AND REPORT ON 50% EXPENDITURE LIMITATION SCHEDULE

The Board of Directors
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Los Angeles, California

Report on Compliance for the Transportation Development Act Program

Opinion on the Transportation Development Act Program

We have audited the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's (LACMTA) compliance with the types of compliance requirements identified as subject to audit in the Transportation Development Act Guidebook, including Public Utility Code Section 99245 as enacted and amended by statute, and the allocation instructions and resolutions of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (as Planning Agency) as required by Section 6667 of the California Code of Regulations adopted by the California Department of Transportation (collectively, Transportation Development Act [TDA]) that could have a direct and material effect on LACMTA's compliance with the Transportation Development Act for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2025.

In our opinion, LACMTA complied, in all material respects, with the compliance requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on the TDA program for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2025.

Basis for Opinion on the Transportation Development Act Program

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 audit requirements specified in the Transportation Development Act. Our responsibilities under those standards and the Transportation Development Act are further described in the Auditor's Responsibilities for the Audit of Compliance section of our report.

We are required to be independent of LACMTA 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 for the Transportation Development Act program. Our audit does not provide a legal determination of LACMTA's compliance with the compliance requirements referred to above.

Responsibilities of Management for Compliance

Management is responsible for compliance with the requirements referred to above 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 grant agreements applicable to the Transportation Development Act 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 LACMTA's 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 Transportation Development Act 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 LACMTA's compliance with the requirements of the Transportation Development Act program.

In performing an audit in accordance with GAAS, *Government Auditing Standards*, and the Transportation Development Act, 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 LACMTA's 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 LACMTA's 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 Transportation Development Act, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the LACMTA's 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.

Report on Internal Control Over Compliance

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

Our consideration of internal control over compliance was for the limited purpose described in the 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. Given these limitations, during our audit we did not identify any deficiencies in internal control over compliance that we consider to be material weaknesses, as defined above. However, material weaknesses or significant deficiencies in internal control over compliance may exist that were not identified.

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.

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 Transportation Development Act. Accordingly, this report is not suitable for any other purpose.

Report on 50% Expenditure Limitation Schedule

We have audited the financial statements of the governmental activities, the business-type activities, each major fund, and the aggregate remaining fund information of LACMTA as of and for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2025, and the related notes to the financial statements, which collectively comprise LACMTA's basic financial statements. We issued our report thereon dated December 23, 2025, which contained unmodified opinions on those financial statements. Our audit was conducted for the purpose of forming opinions on the financial statements that collectively comprise the basic financial statements. The accompanying 50% expenditure limitation schedule is presented for purposes of additional analysis as required by the Transportation Development Act and is not a required part of the basic financial statements. Such information is the responsibility of management and was derived from and relates directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the basic financial statements. The information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the 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 50% expenditure limitation schedule is fairly stated in all material respects in relation to the basic financial statements as a whole.



Crowe LLP

Los Angeles, California
December 23, 2025

LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT
50% EXPENDITURE LIMITATION SCHEDULE
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2025
(Amounts expressed in thousands)

1	Total operating cost	\$	2,537,600
2	Total capital requirements		2,283,677
3	Total debt service		474,402
4	Total of lines 1, 2, and 3		<u>5,295,679</u>
5	Less federal grant received		734,474
6	Less State Transit Assistance (STA) funds received		267,721
7	Total of lines 5 and 6		<u>1,002,195</u>
8	Total of line 4 less line 7		4,293,484
	50% of line 8		<u>2,146,742</u>
	Total permissible Local Transportation Fund expenditures	\$	<u>2,146,742</u>