Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation
Authority
One Gateway Plaza
3rd Floor Board Room
Los Angeles, CA

File #: 2016-0129, **File Type:** Contract **Agenda Number:** 37

2nd REVISED
EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
MARCH 17, 2016

SUBJECT: CONSOLIDATED AUDIT FOR FISCAL YEARS 2016-20

ACTION: AWARD CONTRACTS

RECOMMENDATION

AUTHORIZE the Chief Executive Officer to award a five-year, firm fixed ~~unit~~ price contract, pending the resolution of a protest:

A. Contract No. PS4488900, to **Vasquez & Company, LLP to perform Package A of the fiscal years (FY) 2016-20 Consolidated Financial and Compliance Audit of the programs, jurisdictions and agencies** listed in Attachment C, for $1,583,529 for the base audits and $758,141 for the option audits, for a combined not to exceed total of $2,341,670, effective April 1, 2016; and

B. Contract No. PS4489300, to **Simpson & Simpson, LLP to perform Package B of the fiscal years (FY) 2016-20 Consolidated Financial and Compliance Audit of the programs, jurisdictions and agencies** listed in Attachment D, for $2,572,500 for the base audits and $1,200,000 for the option audits, for a combined not to exceed total of $3,772,500, effective April 1, 2016.

ISSUE

As the Regional Transportation Planner for Los Angeles County, Metro is responsible for planning, programming and allocating transportation funding to Los Angeles County jurisdictions, transit operators and other transportation programs. Metro has the fiduciary responsibility to provide assurance that recipients of funds included in the Consolidated Audit are adhering to the statutes, program guidelines, and/or agreements of each applicable funding source and that operations data used to allocate funds is fair and in accordance with Federal Transit Administration (FTA) guidelines.

The Consolidated Audit process includes financial and compliance audits of the following programs:

1. Local Funding Program to the 88 cities and Unincorporated Los Angeles County.

   a. Proposition A Local Return
   b. Proposition C Local Return
   c. Measure R Local Return
   d. Transit Development Act (TDA) 3
   e. Transit Development Act (TDA) 8
   f. Proposition A Discretionary Incentive Program

2. Transit System Funds to Commerce, Redondo Beach, Torrance, LADOT, Glendale, Pasadena, and Burbank
   a. Transit Development Act (TDA) 4
   b. State Transit Assistance (STA)
   c. Proposition A 95% of 40% Discretionary
   d. Proposition C 5% Security
   e. Proposition C 40% Discretionary
   f. Measure R

3. Fare Subsidies Programs
   a. Immediate Needs Transportation Program (INTP)
   b. Rider Relief Transportation Program (RRTP)
   c. Support for Homeless Re-Entry (SHORE) Program

4. SCRRA Metrolink Program

5. EZ Transit Pass Program

6. Access Services

7. LADOT Operating Data (Proposition A Incentive Programs)

Metro allocates over $400 million annually to these programs and distribute them to 88 cities in Los Angeles County, the County of Los Angeles and other agencies. Audits of these programs are needed to ensure that the agencies comply with the applicable rules, regulations, policies, guidelines and executed Memorandums of Understanding (MOU). The audits also serve as a program management tool for effectively managing and administering these programs.

Vasquez & Company, LLP and Simpson & Simpson, LLP, the independent certified public accounting (CPA)firms, will perform financial and compliance audits to assure management that recipients of subsidies included in the Consolidated Audit are adhering to the statutes of each applicable funding source and that operations data used to allocate funds is fair and in accordance with FTA guidelines. The audits will be conducted in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards and will meet the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants' Standards. In performing these audits, Vasquez & Company, LLP and Simpson & Simpson, LLP will report on management deficiencies where noted and on findings that may result in funds being returned to Metro based on trades or exchange of funds, unused and lapsed funds, and unallowable expenditures.

DISCUSSION

The Consolidated Audit Project is divided into two separate packages, A and B, based primarily on their District geographic location. This creates a more efficient audit process by streamlining the amount of audits required from one firm. In addition, this process provides firms with increased contracting opportunities.

This project includes a Small Business Enterprise (SBE) goal of 27% and Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE) goal of 3%. At the time of Goal Evaluation the estimated dollar value for this procurement was above the $3 million Set-Aside threshold for negotiated awards; therefore, the project was assigned for goal setting.

Option audits is a priced option in the contract to conduct financial and compliance audits of 12 additional Transit System Operators' TDA, STA, Proposition A 95% of 40% Discretionary, Proposition C 5% Security, Proposition C 40% Discretionary, and Measure R funds.

DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT

This Board action will not have an impact on the safety of Metro's patrons or employees.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Funds of $812,765 for year one of these contracts will be included in the FY17 budget in Cost Center 2510, Management Audit under projects 405510 and 100055, account 50316 Services Professional and Technical. The FY17 budget will be amended accordingly if additional funds are needed to exercise any or all options. Since this is a multi-year contract, the Project Manager and cost center managers will be responsible for ensuring that funds are budgeted in subsequent years.

Impacts to Budget

The consolidated audits are funded through P&P Planning Consolidated Audit and Measure R Administration funds. There is no impact to bus and rail operating or capital.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The Board may choose not to authorize the execution of these contracts. This is not recommended since Proposition A, Proposition C, Measure R Ordinances and Metro guidelines, state laws and federal provisions require that audits be conducted on funds allocated. The Consolidated Audit process addresses these requirements and plays a major part in the continued implementation, management and administration of the covered funding programs.

NEXT STEPS

Upon approval by the Board, staff will execute contracts to the recommended contractors, to provide consolidated audits for fiscal years 2016-20.

ATTACHMENTS

A. Procurement Summary
B. DEOD Summary
C. FY 2016-20 List of Funded Projects and Programs to be audited for Package A
D. FY 2016-20 List of Funded Projects and Programs to be audited for Package B

Prepared by: Diana Estrada, Chief Auditor, (213) 922-2161

Reviewed by: Stephanie Wiggins, Deputy CEO, (213) 922-1023;
Ivan Page, Interim Executive Director, Vendor/Contract Management, (213) 922-6383

Phillip A. Washington
Chief Executive Officer

ATTACHMENT A

PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

CONSOLIDATED AUDIT PROGRAM FY 2016 THRU 2020
PS4488900 – VAZQUEZ & COMPANY, LLP
PS4489300 – SIMPSON & SIMPSON, LLP

1.	**Contract Number A:** PS4488900 **Contract Number B:** PS4489300	
2.	**Recommended Vendor A**: Vasquez & Company, LLP **Recommended Vendor B:** Simpson & Simpson, LLP	
3.	**Type of Procurement (check one): IFB RFP RFP–A&E** **Non-Competitive Modification Task Order**	
4.	**Procurement Dates**:	
	A. Issued: November 4, 2015	
	B. Advertised/Publicized: November 4, 2015	
	C. Pre-proposal/Pre-Bid Conference: November 19, 2015	
	D. Proposals/Bids Due: December 15, 2015	
	E. Pre-Qualification Completed: February 23, 2016	
	F. Conflict of Interest Form Submitted to Ethics: January 11, 2016	
	G. Protest Period End Date: March 16, 2016	
5.	**Solicitations Picked up/Downloaded**: 21	**Bids/Proposals Received**: 7
6.	**Contract Administrator**: Rommel Hilario	**Telephone Number**: **(**213) 922-4654
7.	**Project Manager**: Diana Estrada	**Telephone Number**: **(**213) 922-2161

A. Procurement Background

This Board Action is to approve two contract awards in support of Management Audit Services to perform financial and compliance audits, and provide assurances that recipients of subsidies are adhering to the statutes of each applicable funding source as outlined in Request for Proposal (RFP) No. PS21676. The scope of services required under this contract is divided into two separate packages (Package A and B). These packages were constructed primarily based on the geographical locations of the agencies to be audited; to assist each of the firms in meeting strict audit schedules; and to streamline the audit processes for each of these projects. Firms were allowed to propose on Package A, Package B, or both. However, one firm could not be awarded both Packages as provided in the RFP.

The RFP was issued as a competitive negotiated procurement in accordance with Metro's Acquisition Policy. The contract type is firm fixed unit price.

Two amendments were issued during the solicitation phase of this RFP:

- Amendment No. 1, issued on November 20, 2015, extended the proposal due date; and

- Amendment No. 2, issued on November 25, 2015, provided Pre-Proposal Conference materials including answers to questions from proposers.

A Pre-Proposal Conference was held on November 18, 2015 and was attended by four participants representing four firms. A total of seven proposals were received on December 15, 2015.

The seven proposers are listed in alphabetical order:

1. BCA Watson Rice, LLP
2. Conrad & Company CPAs
3. Grant Thornton, LLP
4. Lopez & Company, LLP
5. Simpson & Simpson, LLP
6. Tahim and Associates, APC *
7. Vasquez & Company, LLP

***** Metro staff deemed the proposals from Tahim and Associates as non-responsive. SBE and DVBE forms as required in the RFP were not submitted. Thus, the proposals were not considered by the Proposal Evaluation Team (PET).

B. Evaluation of Proposals

Proposal submittals were evaluated in accordance with the criteria established in the RFP and in compliance with Metro's Acquisition Policy.

The proposals were evaluated based on the following evaluation criteria and weights:

• Degree of the Prime's Skills and Experience	40%
• Understanding of the Statement of Work	35%
• Cost/Price	25%

The evaluation criteria is appropriate and consistent with criteria developed for similar procurements for Management Audit Services. Several factors were considered when developing these weights, giving the greatest importance to the prime's skills and experience in performing the work.

The PET, consisting of staff from Finance, OMB, and Management Audit Services, met on January 15, 2016, to conduct a comprehensive review of the technical qualifications of the proposal submissions received. The PET reviewed proposals based on the technical criteria consistent with the qualifications, experience and resources necessary to meet the requirements of the RFP. Each proposal addressed the firm's degree of skills and experience and understanding of the statement of work. The proposals highlighted the firms' capabilities, and the roles of the proposer's project and management teams.

The PET recommendation for Package A contract award is the following:

1	FIRM	Average Score	Factor Weight	Weighted Average Score	Rank
2	**Vasquez & Company, LLP**				
3	Degree of the Prime's Skills and Experience	88.92	40.00%	35.57	
4	Understanding of the Statement of Work	79.34	35.00%	27.77	
5	Cost	~~84.00~~ 85.58	25.00%	~~21.00~~ 21.39	
6	**Total**		**100.00%**	**~~84.34~~ 84.73**	**1**
7	**Simpson & Simpson, LLP**				
8	Degree of the Prime's Skills and Experience	79.60	40.00%	31.84	
9	Understanding of the Statement of Work	90.00	35.00%	31.50	
10	Cost	~~60.00~~ 62.48	25.00%	~~15.00~~ 15.62	
11	**Total**		**100.00%**	**~~78.34~~ 78.96**	**2**
12	**BCA Watson Rice LLP**				
13	Degree of the Prime's Skills and Experience	78.92	40.00%	31.57	
14	Understanding of the Statement of Work	54.00	35.00%	18.90	
15	Cost	100.00	25.00%	25.00	
16	**Total**		**100.00%**	**75.47**	**3**
17	**Grant Thorton LLP**				
18	Degree of the Prime's Skills and Experience	69.67	40.00%	27.87	
19	Understanding of the Statement of Work	71.34	35.00%	24.97	
20	Cost	~~68.00~~ 69.48	25.00%	~~17.00~~ 17.37	
21	**Total**		**100.00%**	**~~69.84~~ 70.21**	**4**
22	**Conrad & Company CPAs**				
23	Degree of the Prime's Skills and Experience	74.82	40.00%	29.93	
24	Understanding of the Statement of Work	46.00	35.00%	16.10	
25	Cost	~~68.00~~ 69.10	25.00%	~~17.00~~ 17.28	
26	**Total**		**100.00%**	**~~63.03~~ 63.31**	**5**

27	**Lopez & Company, LLP**	**Average Score**	**Factor Weight**	**Weighted Average Score**	**Rank**
28	Degree of the Prime's Skills and Experience	72.25	40.00%	28.90	
29	Understanding of the Statement of Work	36.00	35.00%	12.60	
30	Cost	~~64.00~~ 66.28	25.00%	~~16.00~~ 16.57	
31	**Total**		**100.00%**	**~~57.50~~ 58.07**	**6**

The PET recommendation for Package B is the following:

1	FIRM	Average Score	Factor Weight	Weighted Average Score	Rank
2	**Simpson & Simpson, LLP**				
3	Degree of the Prime's Skills and Experience	79.67	40.00%	31.87	
4	Understanding of the Statement of Work	90.00	35.00%	31.50	
5	Cost	~~84.00~~74.33	25.00%	~~21.00~~ 18.58	
6	**Total**		**100.00%**	**~~84.37~~ 81.95**	**~~1~~ 2**
7	**Vasquez & Company, LLP**				
8	Degree of the Prime's Skills and Experience	88.92	40.00%	35.57	
9	Understanding of the Statement of Work	77.14	35.00%	27.00	
10	Cost	~~78.68~~ 85.45	25.00%	~~19.67~~ 21.36	
11	**Total**		**100.00%**	**~~82.24~~ 83.93**	**~~2~~ 1**
12	**BCA Watson Rice, LLP**				
13	Degree of the Prime's Skills and Experience	78.92	40.00%	31.57	
14	Understanding of the Statement of Work	54.00	35.00%	18.90	
15	Cost	100.00	25.00%	25.00	
16	**Total**		**100.00%**	**75.47**	**~~3~~ 4**
17	**Grant Thorton, LLP**				
18	Degree of the Prime's Skills and Experience	69.67	40.00%	27.87	
19	Understanding of the Statement of Work	71.34	35.00%	24.97	
20	Cost	~~76.00~~ 91.30	25.00%	~~19.00~~ 22.82	
21	**Total**		**100.00%**	**~~71.84~~ 75.66**	**~~4~~ 3**

22	**Conrad**	**Average Score**	**Factor Weight**	**Weighted Average Score**	**Rank**
23	Degree of the Prime's Skills and Experience	74.82	40.00%	29.93	
24	Understanding of the Statement of Work	46.00	35.00%	16.10	
25	Cost	~~73.32~~ 84.74	25.00%	~~18.33~~ 21.19	
26	**Total**		**100.00%**	**~~64.36~~ 67.22**	**5**
27	**Lopez & Company, LLP**				
28	Degree of the Prime's Skills and Experience	72.25	40.00%	28.90	
29	Understanding of the Statement of Work	36.00	35.00%	12.60	
30	Cost	~~73.32~~ 76.52	25.00%	~~18.33~~ 19.13	
31	**Total**		**100.00%**	**~~59.83~~ 60.63**	**6**

C. Cost/Price Analysis

The recommended pricing for the contracts are fair and reasonable based on adequate price competition, historical pricing, and independent cost estimate of the proposals.

Firms, as previously stated, were allowed to propose on Package A, Package B, or both. However, one firm could not be awarded both Packages, as stipulated in the RFP, to ensure firms would meet Metro strict audit schedules and to streamline the audit processes for each of these projects. This cost analysis considers the most total cost efficient approach for the award of Package A and Package B.

Vasquez & Company, LLP advised Metro of a mistake in calculating their total price proposal for Package B. The "Total" and "Cost" scores for Vasquez have been revised to reflect their corrected price. As a result of this score adjustment, Vasquez is the highest ranked firm for Package B. However, staff's recommendation remains unchanged and offers the best value and cost efficiencies to Metro. The combined value for Package A (Vasquez & Company LLP) and Package B (Simpson & Simpson LLP), based on the best value to Metro results in a total cost of $6,114,148. A reversed recommendation between the top two ranked firms for Package A and Package B would result in a higher overall cost of $6,489,182 to Metro. Therefore, staff's recommendation offers an overall cost savings of $375,034 for Metro.

PACKAGE A

PROPOSER	PACKAGE A AMOUNT	METRO ICE	AWARD AMOUNT
Vasquez & Company, LLP	$2,341,648.00	$2,672,421.60	$2,341,648.00
Simpson & Simpson CPAs	$3,207,500.00		
BCA Watson Rice LLP	$2,004,170.00		
Grant Thorton LLP	$2,884,282.00		
Conrad	$2,900,200.00		
Lopez & Company	$3,023,497.98		

PACKAGE B

PROPOSER	PACKAGE B AMOUNT	METRO ICE	AWARD AMOUNT
Simpson & Simpson CPAs	$3,772,500.00	$3,662,094.33	$3,772,500.00
Vasquez & Company, LLP	~~$4,107,070.00~~ **$3,281,682.00**		
BCA Watson Rice LLP	$2,804,215.00		
Grant Thorton LLP	$3,071,228.47		
Conrad	$3,309,150.00		
Lopez & Company	$3,664,528.27		

D. Background on Recommended Contractors

PACKAGE A - Vasquez & Company, LLP

Vasquez & Company, LLP is a full service Certified Public Accounting firm, founded in 1967. Vasquez & Company, LLP has experience in performing financial compliance audits for a variety of not-for-profit organizations, profit organizations, public agencies and publicly traded companies. Vasquez & Company, LLP has performed professional audit services for the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, its predecessors and the Los Angeles Unified School District. Types of audits conducted are cost and closeout audits, overhead rate, change order, pre-award audits in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the U.S. Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards, and the criteria prescribed by Subpart 31.2 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and in conformance with the Cost Accounting Standards Board Procurements. The firm's overall past performance has been satisfactory. Vasquez & Company, LLP was awarded Metro's Consolidated Audit contract for fiscal years 2012 through 2015.

PACKAGE B - Simpson & Simpson, LLP

Simpson & Simpson, LLP, based in Los Angeles, CA, has been in business since 1976. They operate as a partnership and firm of Certified Public Accountants. The firm ranks among the top minority/small business public accounting firms in the United States. Simpson & Simpson, LLP is an experienced audit and consulting firm in the government audit arena and has performed professional services for local, state and federal government agencies as well as private business. Simpson & Simpson, LLP has performed work for the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Los Angeles Unified School District, City of Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles and their various programs. Simpson & Simpson, LLP has provided professional audit services of grants, contract pre-awards, information services and has been a firm on Metro's CPA Bench pool for a number of years. The firm has also provided services on Metro's Consolidated Audits programs during fiscal years FY2004 through FY2007. The firm's overall past performance has been satisfactory. Simpson & Simpson, LLP was awarded Metro's Consolidated Audit contract for fiscal years 2012 through 2015.

DEOD SUMMARY

CONSOLIDATED AUDIT PROGRAM FY 2016 THRU 2020
PS4488900 – VAZQUEZ & COMPANY, LLP
PS4489300 – SIMPSON & SIMPSON, LLP

A. Small Business Participation

The Diversity and Economic Opportunity Department (DEOD) established a 27% Small Business Enterprise (SBE) goal and a 3% Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE) goal for this solicitation. For package A, Vasquez & Company made a 27% SBE and 3% DVBE commitment. For package B, Simpson & Simpson made a 30% SBE and 3% DVBE commitment

Package A - Vasquez & Company

Small Business Goal	27% SBE 3% DVBE	**Small Business Commitment**	27% SBE 3% DVBE

	SBE/DVBE Subcontractors	% Committed
1.	BCA Watson	27% SBE
2.	Daniel Arguello	3% DVBE

Package B – Simpson & Simpson

Small Business Goal	27% SBE 3% DVBE	**Small Business Commitment**	30% SBE 3% DVBE

	SBE/DVBE Subcontractors	% Committed
1.	QUI Accountancy Corp	30% SBE
2.	Dennis Nelson	3% DVBE

B. Living Wage and Service Contract Worker Retention Policy Applicability

The Living Wage and Service Contract Worker Retention Policy is not applicable to this contract.

C. Prevailing Wage Applicability

Prevailing wage is not applicable to this contract.

D. Project Labor Agreement/Construction Careers Policy

Project Labor Agreement/Construction Careers Policy is not applicable to this contract.

PACKAGE A Agencies/Jurisdiction	Local Funding					Transit Funding					Fare Subsidy Programs			
	Prop A Local Return	Prop C Local Return	MR Local Return	Article 3	Article 8	Prop A Incentive	Transit System Funds	Metrolink Program	Access Services	EZ Pass	Immediate Needs	Rider Relief	SHORE	
Agoura Hills	•	•	•	•		•								•
Antelope Valley						•				•				•
Azusa	•	•	•	•		•								•
Baldwin Park	•	•	•	•		•								•
Bell	•	•	•	•		•								•
Bell Gardens	•	•	•	•		•								•
Beverly Hills	•	•	•	•		•								•
Calabasas	•	•	•	•										•
Carson	•	•	•	•		•				•				•
Commerce	•	•	•	•			•			•				•
Compton	•	•	•	•		•								•
Cudahy	•	•	•	•		•								•
Culver City	•	•	•	•		•				•				•
El Monte	•	•	•	•		•								•
Gardena	•	•	•	•		•				•				•
Hawthorne	•	•	•	•										•
Hidden Hills	•	•	•	•										•
Huntington Park	•	•	•	•		•								•
Industry	•	•	•											•
Inglewood	•	•	•	•		•								•
Irwindale	•	•	•	•										•
La Puente	•	•	•	•										•
Lawndale	•	•	•	•		•								•
Los Angeles County	•	•	•	•	•	•								•
Lynwood	•	•	•	•		•								•
Malibu	•	•	•	•		•								•
Maywood	•	•	•	•		•								•
Montebello	•	•	•	•						•				•
Monterey Park	•	•	•	•		•				•				•
Pico Rivera	•	•	•	•		•								•
Pomona	•	•	•	•		•								•
Rosemead	•	•	•	•		•								•
San Fernando	•	•	•	•										•
Santa Fe Springs	•	•	•	•		•								•
Santa Monica	•	•	•	•						•				•
South El Monte	•	•	•	•										•
South Gate	•	•	•	•		•								•
Vernon	•	•		•										•
Walnut	•	•	•	•										•
West Hollywood	•	•	•	•		•								•
Westlake Village	•	•	•	•										•
SCRRA - Metrolink Program								•						•
Access Services									•					•
	40	40	39	39	1	27	1	1	1	8	0	0	0	43

PACKAGE B Agencies/Jurisdiction	Local Funding					Transit Funding					Fare Subsidy Programs			
	Prop A Local Return	Prop C Local Return	MR Local Return	Article 3	Article 8	Prop A Incentive	Transit System Funds	Metrolink Program	Access Services	EZ Pass	Immediate Needs	Rider Relief	SHORE	
Alhambra	•	•	•	•		•								•
Arcadia	•	•	•	•						•				•
Artesia	•	•	•	•		•								•
Avalon	•	•	•	•	•									•
Bellflower	•	•	•	•		•								•
Bradbury	•	•	•	•										•
Burbank	•	•	•	•		•	•			•				•
Cerritos	•	•	•	•		•								•
Claremont	•	•	•	•						•				•
Covina	•	•	•	•		•								•
Diamond Bar	•	•	•	•										•
Downey	•	•	•	•		•								•
Duarte	•	•	•	•		•								•
El Segundo	•	•	•	•										•
Foothill Transit										•				•
Glendale	•	•	•	•		•	•			•				•
Glendora	•	•	•	•		•								•
Hawaiian Gardens	•	•	•	•										•
Hermosa Beach	•	•	•	•										•
La Canada Flintridge	•	•	•	•										•
La Habra Heights	•	•	•	•										•
La Mirada	•	•	•	•										•
La Verne	•	•	•	•										•
Lakewood	•	•	•	•										•
LADOT							•			•				•
Lancaster	•	•	•	•	•									•
Lomita	•	•	•	•										•
Long Beach	•	•	•	•						•				•
Los Angeles City	•	•	•	•		•								•
LA County Dep. Of Public Works										•				•
Los Angeles World Airports										•				•
Manhattan Beach	•	•	•	•		•								•
Monrovia	•	•	•	•		•								•
Norwalk	•	•	•	•						•				•
Palmdale	•	•	•	•	•									•
Palos Verdes Estates	•	•	•	•		•				•				•
Paramount	•	•	•	•										•
Pasadena	•	•	•	•		•	•			•				•
Rancho Palos Verdes	•	•	•	•										•
Redondo Beach	•	•	•	•		•	•			•				•
Rolling Hills	•	•	•	•										•
Rolling Hills Estates	•	•	•	•										•
San Dimas	•	•	•	•										•
San Gabriel	•	•	•	•										•
San Marino	•	•	•	•										•
Santa Clarita	•	•	•	•	•	•				•				•
Sierra Madre	•	•	•	•										•
Signal Hill	•	•	•	•										•
South Pasadena	•	•	•	•		•								•
Temple City	•	•	•	•										•
Torrance	•	•	•	•			•			•				•
West Covina	•	•	•	•		•								•
Whittier	•	•	•	•		•								•
Fame Assistance Corp.											•	•		•
Int'l Institute of LA											•			•
Human Services Assoc.												•		•
Shelter Partnership- SHORE													•	•
	49	49	49	49	4	20	6	0	0	15	2	2	1	57