



**INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT
ON COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS
APPLICABLE TO MEASURE R ORDINANCE AND
MEASURE R LOCAL RETURN GUIDELINES**

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

FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2021



Simpson & Simpson, LLP
Certified Public Accountants

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Measure R Local Return Fund
Consolidated Audit Report
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2021**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INDEPENDENT AUDITOR’S REPORT ON COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO MEASURE R ORDINANCE AND MEASURE R LOCAL RETURN GUIDELINES	1
List of Package B Jurisdictions	4
Compliance Area Tested	5
Summary of Audit Results	
Schedule 1 – Summary of Compliance Findings	6
Schedule 2 - Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs	7



SIMPSON & SIMPSON
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS
FOUNDING PARTNERS
BRAINARD C. SIMPSON, CPA
MELBA W. SIMPSON, CPA

U.S. BANK TOWER
633 WEST 5TH STREET, SUITE 3320
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071
(213) 736-6664 TELEPHONE
(213) 736-6692 FAX
www.simpsonandsimpsoncpas.com

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT ON COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO MEASURE R ORDINANCE AND MEASURE R LOCAL RETURN GUIDELINES

To: Board of Directors of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
and Measure R Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee

Report on Compliance

We have audited the compliance of the forty-nine (49) Cities identified in the List of Package B Jurisdictions, with the types of compliance requirements described in the Measure R Ordinance enacted through a Los Angeles County voter-approved law in November 2008; Measure R Local Return Guidelines, issued by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro), approved by its Board of Directors on October 22, 2009 (collectively, the Guidelines); and the respective Assurances and Understandings Regarding Receipt and Use of Measure R Local Return Funds, executed by Metro and the respective Cities for the year ended June 30, 2021 (collectively, the Requirements). Compliance with the above-noted Guidelines and Requirements by the Cities are identified in the accompanying Summary of Audit Results, Schedule 1 and Schedule 2.

Management's Responsibility

Compliance with the Guidelines and Requirements is the responsibility of the respective Cities' management.

Auditor's Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express opinions on the Cities' compliance with the Guidelines and Requirements referred to above based on our audits. We conducted our audits of compliance in accordance with the auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America; and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audits to obtain reasonable assurance about whether noncompliance with the types of requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on the Measure R Local Return program occurred. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence about each City's compliance with the Guidelines and Requirements and performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

We believe that our audits provide a reasonable basis for our opinions on compliance. However, our audits do not provide a legal determination of each City's compliance with the Guidelines and Requirements.



Opinion

In our opinion, the Cities complied, in all material respects, with the Guidelines and Requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on the Measure R Local Return program for the year ended June 30, 2021.

Other Matters

The results of our auditing procedures disclosed instances of noncompliance, which are required to be reported in accordance with the Guidelines and 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 #2021-001 through #2021-007. Our opinion is not modified with respect to these matters.

Responses by the Cities to the noncompliance findings identified in our audits are described in the accompanying Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs (Schedule 2). The Cities' responses were not subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of compliance, and accordingly, we express no opinion on the responses.

Report on Internal Control Over Compliance

The management of each City is responsible for establishing and maintaining effective internal control over compliance with the Guidelines and Requirements referred to above. In planning and performing our audits of compliance, we considered each City's internal control over compliance with the Guidelines and Requirements that could have a direct and material effect on the Measure R Local Return program to determine the auditing procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances for the purpose of expressing an opinion on compliance and to test and report on internal control over compliance in accordance with the Guidelines and Requirements, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of internal control over compliance. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of each City's internal control over compliance.

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

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 under the Guidelines and Requirements 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 under the Guidelines and Requirements will not be prevented, or detected and corrected, on a timely basis. We consider the deficiencies in internal control over compliance described in the accompanying Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs (Schedule 2) as Finding #2021-004 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 and Requirements 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 deficiencies in internal control over compliance described in the accompanying Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs (Schedule 2) as Findings #2021-003 and #2021-005 to be significant deficiencies.

The responses by the Cities to the internal control over compliance findings identified in our audits are described in the accompanying Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs (Schedule 2). The responses by the Cities were not subject to the 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 on internal control over compliance and the results of that testing based on the requirements of the Guidelines and Requirements. Accordingly, this report is not suitable for any other purpose.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Simpson & Simpson".

Los Angeles, California
December 30, 2021

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Measure R Local Return Fund
List of Package B Jurisdictions
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2021**

- | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. CITY OF ALHAMBRA | 31. CITY OF PALMDALE |
| 2. CITY OF ARCADIA | 32. CITY OF PALOS VERDES ESTATES |
| 3. CITY OF ARTESIA | 33. CITY OF PARAMOUNT |
| 4. CITY OF AVALON | 34. CITY OF PASADENA |
| 5. CITY OF BELLFLOWER | 35. CITY OF RANCHO PALOS VERDES |
| 6. CITY OF BRADBURY | 36. CITY OF REDONDO BEACH |
| 7. CITY OF BURBANK | 37. CITY OF ROLLING HILLS |
| 8. CITY OF CERRITOS | 38. CITY OF ROLLING HILLS ESTATES |
| 9. CITY OF CLAREMONT | 39. CITY OF SAN DIMAS |
| 10. CITY OF COVINA | 40. CITY OF SAN GABRIEL |
| 11. CITY OF DIAMOND BAR | 41. CITY OF SAN MARINO |
| 12. CITY OF DOWNEY | 42. CITY OF SANTA CLARITA |
| 13. CITY OF DUARTE | 43. CITY OF SIERRA MADRE |
| 14. CITY OF EL SEGUNDO | 44. CITY OF SIGNAL HILL |
| 15. CITY OF GLENDALE | 45. CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA |
| 16. CITY OF GLENORA | 46. CITY OF TEMPLE CITY |
| 17. CITY OF HAWAIIAN GARDENS | 47. CITY OF TORRANCE |
| 18. CITY OF HERMOSA BEACH | 48. CITY OF WEST COVINA |
| 19. CITY OF LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE | 49. CITY OF WHITTIER |
| 20. CITY OF LA HABRA HEIGHTS | |
| 21. CITY OF LA MIRADA | |
| 22. CITY OF LA VERNE | |
| 23. CITY OF LAKEWOOD | |
| 24. CITY OF LANCASTER | |
| 25. CITY OF LOMITA | |
| 26. CITY OF LONG BEACH | |
| 27. CITY OF LOS ANGELES | |
| 28. CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH | |
| 29. CITY OF MONROVIA | |
| 30. CITY OF NORWALK | |

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Measure R Local Return Fund
Compliance Area Tested
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2021

1. Funds were expended for transportation purposes.
2. Separate Measure R Local Return Account was established.
3. Revenues received including allocations, project generated revenues and interest income was properly credited to the Measure R Local Return Account.
4. Funds were expended with Metro's approval.
5. Funds were not substituted for property tax and are in compliance with the Maintenance of Effort.
6. Timely use of funds.
7. Administrative expenses are within the 20% cap.
8. Expenditure Plan (Form One or electronic equivalent) was submitted on time.
9. Annual Expenditure Report (Form Two or electronic equivalent) was submitted on time.
10. Where funds expended were reimbursable by other grants or fund sources, the reimbursement was credited to the Local Return Account upon receipt of the reimbursement.
11. Where Measure R 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. A separate account was established for Capital reserve funds and Capital reserve was approved by Metro.
13. Funds were used to augment, not supplant existing local revenues being used for transportation purposes unless there is a fund shortfall.
14. Recreational transit form was submitted on time.
15. Fund exchanges were approved by Metro.
16. Accounting procedures, record keeping and documentation are adequate.

SUMMARY OF AUDIT RESULTS

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Measure R Local Return Fund
Summary of Compliance Findings
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2021**

The audit of the 49 cities identified in the List of Package B Jurisdictions have resulted in 7 findings. The table below shows a summary of the findings:

Finding	# of Findings	Responsible Cities/ Finding Reference	Questioned Costs	Resolved During the Audit
Funds were expended with Metro's approval.	2	Downey (#2021-003) Temple City (#2021-007)	\$ 34,312 2,500	\$ 34,312 2,500
Expenditure Plan (Form One or electronic equivalent) was submitted on time.	1	Claremont (#2021-002)	None	None
Annual Expenditure Report (Form Two or electronic equivalent) was submitted on time.	1	Bradbury (#2021-001)	None	None
Accounting procedures, record keeping, and documentation are adequate.	3	Downey (#2021-004) Glendora (#2021-005) Glendora (#2021-006)	25,885 None 8,647	- None -
Total Findings and Questioned Costs	7		\$ 71,344	\$ 36,812

Details of the findings are in Schedule 2.

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Measure R Local Return Fund
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2021**

Finding #2021-001	City of Bradbury
Compliance Reference	According to Measure R Local Return Guidelines, Section B (II.2), Expenditure Report (Form Two), "The submittal of an Expenditure Report (Form Two) is also required to maintain legal eligibility and meet Measure R LR program compliance requirements. Jurisdictions shall submit a Form Two, to Metro annually, by October 15th (following the conclusion of the fiscal year)."
Condition	The City did not meet the October 15, 2021 deadline for submitting the Annual Expenditure Report in the Local Return Management System (LRMS). Instead, the City submitted the information in the LRMS on December 20, 2021.
Cause	It was due to an oversight by the City's finance department.
Effect	The City did not comply with the Measure R Local Return Guidelines.
Recommendation	We recommend that the City establish procedures to ensure that the annual actual expenditures are entered in the LRMS before the due date so that the City is in compliance with Metro's Guidelines.
Management's Response	The City has a staff turnover during fiscal year 2021 and the new management team was unaware of compliance requirements of Local Return Funds.
Corrected During the Audit	The City subsequently entered the required information in the LRMS on December 20, 2021. No follow up is required.

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Measure R Local Return Fund
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2021
(Continued)**

Finding #2021-002	City of Claremont
Compliance Reference	According to Measure R Local Return Guidelines, Section B (II. 1), Expenditure Plan (Form One): "Jurisdictions shall submit to Metro an Expenditure Plan, annually, on or before August 1st of each fiscal year."
Condition	The City did not meet the August 1, 2020 deadline for submitting the Expenditure Plan in the Local Return Management System (LRMS). In FY2021, Metro extended August 1, 2020 deadline to October 1, 2020, to facilitate a smooth LRMS transition. However, the City updated the information in the LRMS on October 16, 2020.
Cause	This was due to an oversight of the City.
Effect	The City did not comply with the Measure R Local Return Guidelines.
Recommendation	We recommend that the City establish procedures to ensure that the Expenditure Plan is entered in the LRMS before the due date so that the City's expenditures of Measure R Local Return Funds will be in accordance with Metro's approval and the guidelines.
Management's Response	The City concurred with the finding.
Corrected During the Audit	The City subsequently entered the required information in the LRMS on October 16, 2020. No follow-up is required.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Measure R Local Return Fund
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2021
(Continued)

Finding #2021-003	City of Downey
Compliance Reference	According to Measure R Local Return Guidelines, Section B.VII.A, Financial and Compliance Provisions, "The Measure R LR Audits shall include, but not limited to, verification of adherence to the following financial and compliance provisions of this guidelines: Verification that funds were expended with Metro's approval."
Condition	<p>The expenditures for MRLRF's Project Code 720, CIP 17-09: Paramount Boulevard Signalization and Safety Enhancements, in the amount of \$34,312 were incurred prior to Metro's approval. However, the City subsequently received an approved budget amount of \$34,312 from Metro for the MRLRF project on November 16, 2021.</p> <p>This is a repeat finding from the prior fiscal year.</p>
Cause	The request for the budget approval from Metro for this project was overlooked in fiscal year 2020-21.
Effect	The City did not comply with the Guidelines as expenditures for the MRLRF project were incurred prior to Metro's approval.
Recommendation	We recommend that the City establish procedures to ensure that it obtains approval from Metro prior to implementing any Measure R Local Return projects, and properly enter the budgeted amount for each project in the Local Return Management System (LRMS) and submit before the requested due date so that the City's expenditures of Measure R Local Return Funds are in accordance with Metro's approval and the Guidelines.
Management's Response	The City's management agrees with the finding. In the future, the City will review all MRLRF projects prior to the fiscal year end and ensure that each project has the appropriate Metro-approved budget.
Corrected During the Audit	Metro Program Manager granted retroactive budget approval of the said project on November 16, 2021. No follow-up is required.

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Measure R Local Return Fund
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2021
(Continued)**

Finding #2021-004	City of Downey
Compliance Reference	<p>According to Measure R Local Return Guidelines, Section A.I: Program Summary, “The Measure R Ordinance specifies that LR (Local Return) funds are to be used for transportation purposes. No net revenue distributed to Jurisdictions may be used for purposes other than transportation purposes.” and Section B.VII: Audit Section states, “It is the Jurisdictions’ responsibility to maintain proper accounting records and documentation to facilitate the performance of audit prescribed in these guidelines.” In addition, the LACMTA Local Return Program Manager issued a memo dated on April 29, 2014 to jurisdictions to provide recommendations that ensure jurisdictions have adequate evidence to support its compliance with the Local Return Guidelines. The recommendations state, “that an electronic system is acceptable as long as how much time is identified on the project (i.e. not just a clock-in-clock-out system) and this non-timesheet system, excel file or other, is authenticated by the employee and approved by one’s supervisor.” Also, the memo states that:</p> <p>“(4) Where employees work on multiple activities or cost objectives, a distribution of their salaries or wages will be supported by personnel activity reports or equivalent documentation which meets the standards in subsection (5) unless a statistical sampling system (see subsection (6)) or other substitute system has been approved by the cognizant Federal agency. Such documentary support will be required where employees work on:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">:</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">(b) A Federal award and non-Federal award.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">:</p> <p>(5) Personnel activity reports or equivalent documentation must meet the following standards:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(a) They must reflect an after the fact distribution of the actual activity of each employee,</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(e) Budget estimates or other distribution percentages determined before the services are performed do not qualify as support for charges to Federal awards but may be used for interim accounting purposes, provided that: (i) the governmental unit’s system for establishing the estimates produces reasonable approximations of the activity actually performed; (ii) at least quarterly, comparisons of actual costs to budgeted distributions based on monthly activity reports are made. Costs charged to Federal awards to reflect adjustments made as a result of the activity actually performed may be recorded annually if the quarterly comparisons show the differences between budgeted and actual costs are less than ten percent; and (iii) the budget estimates or other distribution percentages are revised as least quarterly, if necessary, to reflect changed circumstances.”</p>

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Measure R Local Return Fund
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2021
(Continued)

Finding #2021-004 (Continued)	City of Downey
Condition	<p>To support the propriety of expenditures charged to the Measure R Local Return Fund, the salaries and benefits expenditures should be supported by time records, activity reports, special funding certifications, or other official documentation evidencing in proper detail the nature of the charges. However, the salaries and benefits charged to Public Works Executive Management Salary Project Code 630 in the amount of \$25,885 were based on estimated percentages on MRLRF activity rather than the employee's actual hours worked on the project. Although the City provided a time study listing for the employees charged to MRLRF, the salaries and benefits were based on estimated percentages. Moreover, the hours were not adjusted to reflect the "true" hours worked on the projects at the end of the fiscal year 2020-21.</p> <p>This is a repeat finding from the prior five fiscal years.</p>
Cause	<p>The City allocated the salaries and benefits charges based on a time study from fiscal year 2011-12. The same percentage allocations were used in prior fiscal years. Additionally, the City believed the estimated percentages charged to the funds for salaries and benefit expenses were still less than the actual costs incurred for the programs.</p>
Effect	<p>The payroll costs claimed under the MRLRF projects may include expenditures which may be disallowed Measure R project expenditures. This resulted in questioned cost of \$25,885.</p>
Recommendation	<p>We recommend that the City reimburse its MRLRF account for \$25,885. In addition, we recommend that the City strengthen its controls over the allocation of payroll costs by using a supported allocation basis, time sheets or similar documentation to substantiate the actual hours worked by employees charged to the program.</p>
Management's Response	<p>The City's management agrees that the amounts were based on a time study from fiscal year 2011-12. However, the City believes that the percentage charged to all City funds (Enterprise, Special Revenue, Successor Agency) for salaries and benefits are less than the actual costs incurred for the programs. Although the City implemented KRONOS, an online-based timekeeping system, for the staff to properly allocate the actual time spent on projects and to be able to track the time spent on each program since fiscal year 2019-20, the City plans to have an outside agency perform a cost allocation study to help determine a more appropriate allocation of the salaries and benefits to the funds in fiscal year 2021-22. The study is estimated to begin in February 2022 and to be completed by July 1, 2022.</p>

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Measure R Local Return Fund
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2021
(Continued)

Finding #2021-005	City of Glendora
Compliance Reference	The Measure R Local Return Guidelines, Section A.I: Program Summary, states, “The Measure R Ordinance specifies that Local Return funds are to be used for transportation purposes. No net revenue distributed to Jurisdictions may be used for purposes other than transportation purposes.” and Section B.VII: Audit Section, “It is the Jurisdictions’ responsibility to maintain proper accounting records and documentation to facilitate the performance of audit prescribed in these guidelines.”
Condition	<p>During our payroll testing, the City provided both the timesheets and the Special Funding Time Certification (Certification), a supplemental form for the timesheet that is signed by both the employee and the employee’s supervisor. The Certification is prepared annually and provides the hours worked by the employee on MRLRF projects for all pay periods during the fiscal year 2020-21.</p> <p>The pay periods tested were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) December 27, 2020 b) January 10, 2021 c) January 24, 2021 d) June 27, 2021 <p>We noted that the Certifications sampled were signed and dated by the employees and supervisors after the year-end, October 2021, which were four to ten months after the fact.</p> <p>This is a repeat finding from prior fiscal year.</p>
Cause	During fiscal year 2020-21, the Finance division experienced staff turnovers and the City staff who was directly involved in the preparation of the annual Certifications was on leave for four months from June 2021 through September 2021. Due to the turnover and the absence of the City staff, the Certifications were not prepared and signed by both employees and supervisors in a timely manner.
Effect	Without employees and supervisors preparing the timecards/certifications in a timely manner, the City may be unable to substantiate the actual hours worked by the employees who were charged to the programs. Untimely support for salaries could result in disallowed costs.
Recommendation	We recommend the City strengthen controls over payroll so that all employees and supervisors prepare, review, sign, and date the Certifications at minimum, on a monthly basis, to ensure the accuracy of hours worked on the local return funds’ projects.
Management’s Response	The City will re-evaluate the preparation of the Certifications process to ensure that the forms are signed and dated by the employees and supervisors within a reasonable period of time, either monthly or quarterly.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Measure R Local Return Fund
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2021
(Continued)

Finding #2021-006	City of Glendora
Compliance Reference	The Measure R Local Return Guidelines, Section A.I: Program Summary, states, “The Measure R Ordinance specifies that Local Return funds are to be used for transportation purposes. No net revenue distributed to Jurisdictions may be used for purposes other than transportation purposes.” and Section B.VII: Audit Section, “It is the Jurisdictions’ responsibility to maintain proper accounting records and documentation to facilitate the performance of audit prescribed in these guidelines.”
Condition	<p>During fiscal year 2020-21, the City recorded expenditures to MRLRF’s Street Repair and Maintenance Project Code 705 in the amount of \$38,874 which were contributions to the pension plan that was provided through CalPERS. The contributions were based on CalPERS employer rate of 10.502% multiplied by the employees’ gross salaries.</p> <p>Based on our calculation, we determined that the City over-allocated \$8,647 of pension contributions to MRLRF.</p>
Cause	This is the first year that the City allocated debt service payments to the Pension Obligation Bonds outside of the issuance year. The City estimated the allocations based on trends and analysis, but did not establish a system to allocate the payments of the actual pension costs to the affected funds.
Effect	The unsupported pension benefits allocated to MRLRF resulted in questioned costs of \$8,647.
Recommendation	We recommend that the City reimburse its MRLRF account for \$8,647. In addition, we recommend that the City strengthen its controls over the allocation of pension costs by using the proper basis, the actual salaries charged to the fund multiplied by the appropriate employer rate provided by CalPERS.
Management’s Response	The City plans to reimburse its MRLRF account in the amount of \$8,647 in January 2022. Also, the City will continue to monitor and evaluate the process for charging pension benefits to ensure that the proper debt service payments are allocated to the City funds, including the local return funds.

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Measure R Local Return Fund
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2021
(Continued)**

Finding #2021-007	City of Temple City
Compliance Reference	According to Measure R Local Return Guidelines, Section B.VII.A, Financial and Compliance Provisions, “The Measure R LR Audits shall include, but not limited to, verification of adherence to the following financial and compliance provisions of this guidelines: Verification that funds were expended with Metro’s approval.”
Condition	The expenditures for MRLRF’s Project Code 705, San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Analysis, in the amount of \$2,500 were incurred prior to Metro’s approval. However, the City subsequently received an approved budget amount of \$2,500 from Metro for the MRLRF project on December 2, 2021.
Cause	Due to the mitigated coronavirus (COVID-19) protocols, the City staff were not able to coordinate their efforts to obtain approval prior to incurring expenditures on MRLRF projects.
Effect	The City did not comply with the Guidelines as expenditures for the MRLRF project were incurred prior to Metro’s approval.
Recommendation	We recommend that the City establish procedures to ensure that it obtains approval from Metro prior to implementing any Measure R Local Return projects, and properly enter the budgeted amount for each project in the Local Return Management System (LRMS) and submit before the requested due date so that the City’s expenditures of Measure R Local funds are in accordance with Metro’s approval and the Guidelines.
Management’s Response	The City instructed the employees who are involved in obtaining budget approvals to ensure that the proper approvals are received from Metro before expenditures are incurred on MRLRF projects.
Corrected During the Audit	Metro Program Manager granted retroactive approval of the said project on December 2, 2021. No follow-up is required.