



## Board Report

---

**File #:** 2023-0057, **File Type:** Informational Report

**Agenda Number:** 4.

---

**MEASURE M INDEPENDENT TAXPAYER  
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE  
MARCH 1, 2023**

**SUBJECT: MEASURE M AUDITS OF FISCAL YEAR 2022**

**ACTION: RECEIVE AND FILE**

**RECOMMENDATION**

RECEIVE AND FILE the Independent Auditor's Report on:

- A. Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures for Measure M Special Revenue Fund for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 2022, completed by BCA Watson Rice, LLP (BCA);
- B. Compliance with Requirements Applicable to Measure M Ordinance and Measure M Local Return Guidelines for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 2022, completed by Vasquez & Company, LLP (Vasquez); and
- C. Compliance with Requirements Applicable to Measure M Ordinance and Measure M Local Return Guidelines for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 2022, completed by Simpson & Simpson, CPAs (Simpson).

**ISSUE**

On November 9, 2016, Los Angeles County voters approved Measure M that imposed a half-cent transaction and use tax for transportation and the indefinite extension of an existing half-cent sales tax (Measure R) also dedicated to transportation and originally set to expire in 2039. Measure M, also known as the Los Angeles County Traffic Improvement Plan Ordinance (Ordinance) establishes an Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee and an oversight process to ensure that the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) complies with the terms of the Ordinance. The oversight process requires that an annual audit be completed within six months after the end of the fiscal year to determine compliance with the provisions of the Ordinance related to the receipt and expenditure of sales tax revenues during the fiscal year. The audit must be provided to the Oversight Committee so that the Oversight Committee can determine whether LACMTA and local subrecipients have complied with the Measure M requirements.

## **DISCUSSION**

The following summarizes the independent auditor's report on Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures for Measure M Special Revenue Fund:

Management Audit Services contracted with BCA to perform the independent audit of the LACMTA, as required by the Ordinance. BCA conducted the audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that BCA plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the Schedule of Measure M Revenues and Expenditures (Schedule) is free of material misstatement.

The auditors found that the Schedule referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the Measure M Revenues and Expenditures of LACMTA for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2022, in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. The auditors also found that LACMTA complied, in all material respects, with the requirements of the Ordinance for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2022.

The following summarizes the independent auditor's report on Compliance with Requirements Applicable to Measure M Ordinance and Measure M Local Return Guidelines:

Management Audit Services contracted with two firms, Vasquez and Simpson, to conduct the audits of Measure M sales tax revenues used by the County of Los Angeles (County) as well as the 88 cities (Cities). The firms conducted the audit of compliance in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that the independent auditors plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether noncompliance with the requirements in the Ordinance which could have a direct and material effect on the Measure M Local Return program occurred.

Vasquez concluded that the County and the 39 Cities, complied in all material respects, with the requirements in the Ordinance that are applicable to the Measure M Local Return program for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2022. Vasquez found seven (7) instances of noncompliance, which are summarized in Schedule 2 of Attachment B.

Simpson concluded that the 49 Cities complied, in all material respects, with the requirements in the Ordinance that are applicable to the Measure M Local Return program for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2022. Simpson found eleven (11) instances of noncompliance, which are summarized in Schedule 2 of Attachment C.

## **NEXT STEPS**

A public hearing will be scheduled.

## **ATTACHMENT(S)**

- A. Independent Auditor's Report on Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures for Measure M Special Revenue Fund for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022 (BCA)
- B. Report on Compliance with Requirements Applicable to Measure M Ordinance and Measure M Local Return Guidelines (Vasquez)
- C. Report on Compliance with Requirements Applicable to Measure M Ordinance and Measure M Local Return Guidelines (Simpson and Simpson)

Prepared by: Lauren Choi, Deputy Executive Officer, Administration (Interim),  
(213) 922-3926  
Monica Del Toro, Senior Manager, Audit, (213) 922-7494

Reviewed by: Sharon Gookin, Deputy Chief Executive Officer, (213) 418-3101

*Los Angeles County*  
**Metropolitan Transportation Authority**

---

**Independent Auditor's Report  
On Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures  
For  
Measure M Special Revenue Fund**

**For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022  
(With Comparative Totals For 2021)**



---

2355 Crenshaw Blvd. Suite 150 Torrance, CA 90501  
t: (310) 792-4640 f: (310) 792-4140

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority**  
Measure M Special Revenue Fund  
For the Year Ended June 30, 2022

---

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Independent Auditor’s Report .....	1
<b>Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures:</b>	
Measure M Special Revenue Fund Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures .....	4
Notes to the Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures for Measure M Special Revenue Fund.....	5
<b>Required Supplemental Information (Unaudited):</b>	
Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures - Budget and Actual  For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2022 .....	9
<b>Other Reports:</b>	
Independent Auditor’s Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting and on Compliance and Other Matters Based on an Audit of Financial Statements Performed in Accordance with <i>Government Auditing Standards</i> .....	10
Independent Auditor’s Report on Compliance with Requirements Applicable to Measure M Revenues and Expenditures in Accordance with the <i>Los Angeles County Traffic Improvement Plan</i> .....	12
Summary of Current Year Audit Findings.....	15
Status of Prior Year Audit Findings .....	16

## **Independent Auditor's Report**

Measure M Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee  
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

### **Report on the Audit of the Schedule of Measure M Revenues and Expenditures**

#### ***Opinion***

We have audited the accompanying Schedule of Measure M Revenues and Expenditures (the Schedule) of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2022, and the related notes to the Schedule, which collectively comprise LACMTA's basic Schedule as listed in the table of contents.

In our opinion, the Schedule referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the Measure M Revenues and Expenditures of LACMTA for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2022, in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

#### ***Basis for Opinion***

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

#### ***Emphasis of Matter***

As discussed in Note 3 to the Schedule, the accompanying Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures of the Measure M Fund is intended to present the revenues and expenditures attributable to the Measure M Fund. They do not purport to, and do not, present fairly the financial position of the LACMTA, as of June 30, 2022, and the changes in its financial position for the year then ended, in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. Our report is not modified with respect to this matter.

#### ***Responsibilities of Management for the Schedule of Measure M Revenues and Expenditures***

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

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

***Auditor's Responsibilities for the Audit of the Schedule of Measure M Revenues and Expenditures***

Our objectives are to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the Schedule as a whole is free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error, and to issue an auditor's report that includes our opinion. Reasonable assurance is a high level of assurance but is not absolute assurance and therefore is not a guarantee that an audit conducted in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and *Government Auditing Standards* will always detect a material misstatement when it exists. The risk of not detecting a material misstatement resulting from a fraud is higher than for one resulting from error, as fraud may involve collusion, forgery, intentional omissions, misrepresentations, or the override of internal control. Misstatements are considered material if there is a substantial likelihood that, individually or in the aggregate, they would influence the judgment made by a reasonable user based on the Schedule.

In performing an audit in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and *Government Auditing Standards*, we:

- Exercise professional judgment and maintain professional skepticism throughout the audit.
- Identify and assess the risks of material misstatement of the Schedule, whether due to fraud or error, and design and perform audit procedures responsive to those risks. Such procedures include examining, on a test basis, evidence regarding the amounts and disclosures in the Schedule.
- Obtain an understanding of internal control relevant to the audit in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the LACMTA's internal control. Accordingly, no such opinion is expressed.
- Evaluate the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluate the overall presentation of the Schedule.
- Conclude whether, in our judgement, there are conditions or events, considered in the aggregate, that raise substantial doubt about the LACMTA's ability to continue as a going concern for a reasonable period of time.

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

***Required Supplementary Information***

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

***Prior-Year Comparative Information***

We have previously audited the Schedule of Measure M Revenues and Expenditures of LACMTA, and we expressed an unmodified audit opinion in our report dated November 8, 2021. In our opinion, the summarized comparative information presented herein for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2022, is consistent, in all material respects, with the audited Schedule from which it has been derived.

*BCA Watson Rice, LLP*

Torrance, CA  
November 17, 2022



**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority**  
**Measure M Special Revenue Fund**  
**Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures**  
**For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022**  
**(With Comparative Totals for 2021)**  
**(Amounts expressed in thousands)**

---

	<b>2022</b>	<b>2021</b>
Revenues		
Sales tax	\$ 1,089,933	\$ 911,235
Intergovernmental	-	7,005
Investment income	5,900	6,004
Net decline in fair value of investments	(15,666)	(5,420)
	1,080,167	918,824
Expenditures		
Administration and other	57,292	31,881
Transportation subsidies	327,855	223,876
	385,147	255,757
Excess of revenues over expenditures	695,020	663,067
Other financing sources (uses)		
Transfers out	(256,030)	(624,082)
Proceeds from long term debt	-	1,500
	(256,030)	(622,582)
Excess (deficiency) of revenues and other financing sources over expenditures and other financing uses	\$ 438,990	\$ 40,485

The Notes to the Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures are an integral part of this Schedule.

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority**  
Measure M Special Revenue Fund  
Notes to the Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures  
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022

---

The Notes to the Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures are summaries of significant accounting policies and other disclosures considered necessary for a clear understanding of the accompanying schedule of revenues and expenditures.

Unless otherwise stated, all dollar amounts are expressed in thousands.

**1. Organization**

**General**

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) is governed by a Board of Directors composed of the five members of the County Board of Supervisors, the Mayor of the City of Los Angeles, three members appointed by the Mayor, and four members who are either mayors or members of a city council and have been appointed by the Los Angeles County City Selection Committee to represent the other cities in the County, and a non-voting member appointed by the Governor of the State of California.

LACMTA is unique among the nation's transportation agencies. It serves as transportation planner and coordinator, designer, builder and operator for one of the country's largest and most populous counties. More than 10 million people, about one third of California's residents, live, work, and play within its 1,433-square-mile service area.

**Measure M**

Measure M, also known as Ordinance No. 16-01, the Los Angeles County Traffic Improvement Plan, is a special revenue fund used to account for the proceeds of the voter-approved one-half percent sales tax that became effective on November 8, 2016 and the rate of the tax shall increase to one percent on July 1, 2039, immediately upon expiration of the one-half percent sales tax imposed by Traffic Relief and Rail Expansion Ordinance (Measure M).

Revenues collected are required to be allocated in the following manner: 1) 5% for Metro rail operations; 2) 20% for transit operations (Metro and Municipal Providers); 3) 2% for ADA Paratransit for the disabled and Metro discounts for seniors and students; 4) 35% for transit construction; 5) 2% for Metro State of Good Repair projects; 6) 17% for highway construction; 7) 2% for Metro active transportation program; 8) 16% for local return - base for local projects and transit services; and 9) 1% for local return for regional rail.

**2. Summary of Significant Accounting Policies**

The Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures for the Measure M Special Revenue Fund was prepared in conformity with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) in the United States of America as applied to governmental units. The Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) is the recognized standard-setting body for establishing governmental accounting and financial reporting principles for governments.

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority**  
Measure M Special Revenue Fund  
Notes to the Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures  
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022

---

**2. Summary of Significant Accounting Policies (Continued)**

The most significant of LACMTA's accounting policies with regard to the special revenue fund type are described below:

**Fund Accounting**

LACMTA utilizes fund accounting to report its financial position and the results of its operations. Fund accounting is designed to demonstrate legal compliance and to aid financial management by segregating transactions related to certain governmental functions or activities. A fund is a separate accounting entity with a self-balancing set of accounts. Funds are classified into three categories: governmental, proprietary, and fiduciary. Governmental Funds are used to account for most of LACMTA's governmental activities. The measurement focus is a determination of changes in financial position, rather than a net income determination. LACMTA uses governmental fund type Special Revenue Fund to account for Measure M sales tax revenues and expenditures. Special Revenue Funds are used to account for proceeds of specific revenue sources that are legally restricted to expenditures for specified purposes.

**Basis of Accounting**

The modified accrual basis of accounting is used for the special revenue fund type. Under the modified accrual basis of accounting, revenues are recorded when susceptible to accrual, which means measurable (amount can be determined) and available (collectible within the current period or soon enough thereafter to be used to pay liabilities of the current period).

**Budgetary Accounting**

The established legislation and adopted policies and procedures provide that the LACMTA's Board approves an annual budget. Annual budgets are adopted on a basis consistent with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles in the United States of America for all governmental funds.

Prior to the adoption of the budget, the Board conducts public hearings for discussion of the proposed annual budget and at the conclusion of the hearings, but no later than June 30, adopts the final budget. All appropriations lapse at fiscal year-end. The budget is prepared by fund, project, expense type, and department. The legal level of control is at the fund level and the Board must approve additional appropriations. By policy, the Board has provided procedures for management to make revisions within operational or project budgets only when there is no net dollar impact to the total appropriations at the fund level. Budget amendments are made when needed.

Annual budgets are adopted by LACMTA on the modified accrual basis of accounting for the special revenue fund types, on a basis consistent with GAAP as reflected in the Schedule.

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority**  
Measure M Special Revenue Fund  
Notes to the Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures  
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022

---

**2. Summary of Significant Accounting Policies (Continued)**

**Investment Income and Net Decline in Fair Value of Investments**

Investment income and net decline in fair value of investments are shown on the Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures. LACMTA maintains a pooled cash and investments account that is available for use by all funds, except those restricted by State statutes. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2022, the Measure M fund had investment income of \$5,900 and net decline in fair value of investments of \$15,666. The net decline in investments was mainly due to a decrease in fair market value of the investment portfolios mostly invested in bonds, which are sensitive to changes in interest rates.

**Use of Estimates**

The preparation of the Schedule in conformity with GAAP requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of revenues and expenditures during the reporting period. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

**Comparative Financial Data**

The amounts shown for 2021 in the accompanying Schedule are included only to provide a basis for comparison with 2022 and are not intended to present all information necessary for a fair presentation in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles.

**3. Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures for Measure M Special Revenue Fund**

The Schedule is intended to reflect the revenues and expenditures of the Measure M fund only. Accordingly, the Schedule does not purport to, and does not, present fairly the financial position of the LACMTA and changes in financial position thereof for the year then ended in conformity with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles in the United States of America.

**4. Intergovernmental Transactions**

Any transaction conducted with a governmental agency outside the complete jurisdiction of LACMTA will be recorded in an account designated as Intergovernmental.

**5. Operating Transfers**

Amounts reflected as operating transfers represent permanent, legally authorized transfers from a fund receiving revenue to the fund through which the resources are to be expended. All operating transfers in/out of the Measure M Special Revenue Fund have been made in accordance with all expenditure requirements of the Measure M Ordinance.

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority**  
**Measure M Special Revenue Fund**  
**Notes to the Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures**  
**For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022**

---

**6. Excess of Revenues and Other Financing Sources Over Expenditures and Other Financing Uses**

The Measure M fund at June 30, 2022 had an excess of revenues over expenditures and other financing uses of \$438,990 due to 1) higher sales tax revenues resulting from an increase in consumer spending as the economy recovered from the pandemic recession, and 2) decrease in transfers out on bus and rail operating projects as a result of one-time federal funding provided by the stimulus grants. The foregoing factors contributed to the increase in Measure M Fund balance from \$672,442 to \$1,111,432 at June 30, 2022.

**8. Audited Financial Statements**

The audited financial statements for the Measure M Special Revenue Fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2022 are included in LACMTA's Audited Annual Comprehensive Financial Report (ACFR).

**9. Contingent Liabilities**

LACMTA is aware of potential claims that may be filed against them. The outcome of these matters is not presently determinable, but the resolution of these matters is not expected to have a significant impact on the financial condition of LACMTA.

**10. COVID-19 Impact and Considerations**

The COVID-19 outbreak in the United States has caused business disruption through mandated and voluntary closings of businesses. While the disruption is currently expected to be temporary, there is considerable uncertainty around its duration. LACMTA expects this matter to negatively impact its operating environment; however, the related financial impact and duration cannot be reasonably estimated at this time.

**11. Subsequent Events**

In preparing the Schedule of Measure M Revenues and Expenditures, LACMTA has evaluated events and transactions for potential recognition or disclosure through November 17, 2022, the date the schedule was available to be issued. Based on this evaluation, it was determined that no subsequent events occurred that require recognition or additional disclosure in the Schedule.

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority**  
Measure M Special Revenue Fund  
Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures – Budget and Actual  
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022  
(Amounts expressed in thousands)

---

	<b>Budgeted Amounts</b>		<b>Actual</b>	<b>Variance with Final Budget</b>
	<b>Original</b>	<b>Final</b>		
Revenues				
Sales tax	\$ 865,000	\$ 865,000	\$ 1,089,933	\$ 224,933
Intergovernmental	10,494	10,494	-	(10,494)
Investment income	-	-	5,900	5,900
Net decline in fair value of investments	-	-	(15,666)	(15,666)
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total revenues	875,494	875,494	1,080,167	204,673
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Expenditures				
Administration and other	65,474	71,610	57,292	14,318
Transportation subsidies	318,391	316,136	327,855	(11,719)
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total expenditures	383,865	387,746	385,147	2,599
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Excess of revenues over expenditures	491,629	487,748	695,020	207,272
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Other financing sources (uses)				
Transfers in	13,367	13,367	-	(13,367)
Transfers out	(649,370)	(649,370)	(256,030)	393,340
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total other financing sources (uses)	(636,003)	(636,003)	(256,030)	379,973
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Excess (deficiency) of revenues and other financing sources over expenditures and other financing uses	<u>\$ (144,374)</u>	<u>\$ (148,255)</u>	<u>\$ 438,990</u>	<u>\$ 587,245</u>

**Independent Auditor's Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting and on  
Compliance and Other Matters Based on an Audit of Financial Statements  
Performed in Accordance with *Government Auditing Standards***

Measure M Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee  
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

We have audited, in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to the financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, the Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures (the Schedule) for Measure M Special Revenue Fund of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2022, and the related notes to the Schedule, which collectively comprised LACMTA's basic Schedule, and have issued our report thereon dated November 17, 2022.

**Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting**

In planning and performing our audit of the Schedule, we considered the LACMTA's internal control over financial reporting (internal control) as a basis for designing audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances for the purpose of expressing our opinions on the Schedule, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the LACMTA's internal control. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the LACMTA's internal control.

*A deficiency in internal control* exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct misstatements on a timely basis. *A material weakness* is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control, such that there is a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement of the LACMTA's Schedule will not be prevented, or detected and corrected on a timely basis. *A significant deficiency* is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control that is less severe than a material weakness, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance.

Our consideration of internal control was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control that might be material weaknesses or significant deficiencies. Given these limitations, during our audit we did not identify any deficiencies in internal control that we consider to be material weaknesses. However, material weaknesses may exist that have not been identified.

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

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the LACMTA's Schedule is free of material misstatement, we performed tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements, noncompliance with which could have a direct and material effect on the Schedule. However, providing an opinion on compliance with those provisions was not an objective of our audit, and accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. The results of our tests disclosed no instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under *Government Auditing Standards*.

## **Purpose of This Report**

The purpose of this report is solely to describe the scope of our testing of internal control and compliance and the results of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on the effectiveness of the entity's internal control or on compliance. This report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* in considering the entity's internal control and compliance. Accordingly, this communication is not suitable for any other purpose.

*BCA Watson Rice, LLP*

Torrance, California  
November 17, 2022



**Independent Auditor’s Report on Compliance with Requirements Applicable to  
Measure M Revenues and Expenditures in Accordance with the  
*Los Angeles County Traffic Improvement Plan Ordinance No. 16-01***

Measure M Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee  
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

**Report on Compliance**

***Opinion on Measure M Revenues and Expenditures***

We have audited the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) compliance with the *Los Angeles County Traffic Improvement Plan Ordinance No. 16-01* (the Ordinance) applicable to LACMTA’s Measure M revenues and expenditures for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2022.

In our opinion, LACMTA complied, in all material respects, with the requirements referred to above that are applicable to the Measure M revenues and expenditures for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2022.

***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. Our responsibilities under those standards 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. 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 Measure M revenues and expenditures.

### ***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 with Measure M revenues and expenditures 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 and *Government Auditing Standards* 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 Measure M revenues and expenditures as a whole.

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

- Exercise professional judgement 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 LACMTA's compliance with the compliance requirements referred to above and performing other procedures as necessary in the circumstances.
- Obtain an understanding of 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 Measure M revenues and expenditures, 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, 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 on a timely basis. *A material weakness in internal control over compliance* is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control over compliance, such that there is a reasonable possibility that material noncompliance with a compliance requirement 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 compliance requirement 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 weakness 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 have not been identified.

Our audit was not designed for the purpose of expressing an opinion on 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 compliance requirements of the Measure M revenues and expenditures. Accordingly, this report is not suitable for any other purpose.

*BCA Watson Rice, LLP*

Torrance, California  
November 17, 2022

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority**  
Measure M Special Revenue Fund  
Summary of Current Year Audit Findings  
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022

---

None noted.

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority**  
Measure M Special Revenue Fund  
Status of Prior Year Audit Findings

---

None noted.



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

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

**FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2022**



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

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

**FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2022**

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
Measure M Local Return Fund  
Consolidated Audit Report  
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
<b>INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT ON COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO MEASURE M ORDINANCE AND MEASURE M LOCAL RETURN GUIDELINES</b>	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





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

**To: Board of Directors of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
and Measure M Independent Taxpayer 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 Measure M Ordinance enacted through a Los Angeles County voter-approved law in November 2016; Measure M Local Return Guidelines, issued by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro), approved by its Board of Directors on June 22, 2017 (collectively, the Guidelines); and the respective Assurances and Understandings Regarding Receipt and Use of Measure M Local Return Funds, executed by Metro, the County and the respective Cities for the year ended June 30, 2022 (collectively, the Requirements). Compliance with the above-noted 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 Requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on the Measure M Local Return program for the year ended June 30, 2022.

***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 program agreements applicable to the County and each City's Measure M 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 which are described in the accompanying Summary of Compliance Findings (Schedule 1) and Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs (Schedule 2) as Findings #2022-001 through #2022-007. Our opinion is not modified with respect to these matters.



*Government Auditing Standards* requires 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 have not been identified. However, as discussed below, we did identify 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 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 #2022-003, that we consider 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 deficiencies in internal control over compliance described in the accompanying Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs (Schedule 2) as Findings #2022-004 and #2022-005, that we consider to be significant deficiencies.

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 audits are 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 30, 2022**

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
Measure M Local Return Fund  
List of Package A Jurisdictions  
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022**

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**  
**Measure M Local Return Fund**  
**Compliance Area Tested**  
**Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022**

1. Funds were expended for transportation purposes.
2. Separate Measure M Local Return Account was established.
3. Revenues received including allocations, project generated revenues and interest income was properly credited to the Measure M 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 M-One or electronic equivalent) was submitted on time.
9. Expenditure Report (Form M-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 M 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 (trades, loans, or gifts) were approved by Metro.
16. Accounting procedures, record keeping and documentation are adequate.

## **SUMMARY OF AUDIT RESULTS**

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
Measure M Local Return Fund  
Summary of Compliance Findings  
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022**

The audits of the County of Los Angeles and 39 cities have resulted in 7 findings. The table below summarizes those findings:

<b>Finding</b>	<b># of Findings</b>	<b>Responsible Cities/ Finding No. Reference</b>	<b>Questioned Costs</b>	<b>Resolved During the Audit</b>
Funds were expended with Metro's approval.	4	Bell (See Finding #2022-001)	\$ 30,428	\$ 30,428
		Calabasas (See Finding #2022-003)	41,656	41,656
		Compton (See Finding #2022-004)	813,333	813,333
		Montebello (See Finding #2022-005)	52,957	52,957
Expenditure Plan (Form M-One or electronic equivalent) was submitted on time.	3	Bell Gardens (See Finding #2022-002)	None	None
		South Gate (See Finding #2022-006)	None	None
		Vernon (See Finding #2022-007)	None	None
<b>Total Findings and Questioned Costs</b>	<b>7</b>		<b>\$ 938,374</b>	<b>\$ 938,374</b>

Details of the findings are in Schedule 2.



**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
Measure M Local Return Fund  
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs  
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022**

<b>Finding #2022-001</b>	<b>City of Bell</b>
<b>Compliance Reference</b>	<p>Section XXV Administrative, Reporting Requirements, Expenditure Plan (8/1 Table) of the Measure M Local Return Guidelines states that, "To maintain legal eligibility and meet Measure M LR program compliance requirements, Jurisdiction shall submit to Metro an Expenditure Plan (8/1 Table), annually, by August 1st of each year".</p> <p>"Expenditure Plan (Form M-One) provides a listing of projects funded with Measure M LR funds along with estimated expenditures for the year. For both operating and capital projects, Part I is to be filled out. Part II is to be filled out for capital projects (projects over \$250,000). Metro will provide LR funds to a capital project or program sponsor who submits the required expenditure plan".</p>
<b>Condition</b>	<p>The City claimed expenditures under MMLRF Project Code 170, Maintenance and Operation, totaling \$30,428 prior to approval by Metro.</p> <p>Although we found the expenditures to be eligible for Local Return funding, the projects had no prior approval from Metro.</p>
<b>Cause</b>	Due to staffing constraints, the budget request was not properly allocated and reviewed when it was submitted online.
<b>Effect</b>	The City claimed expenditures totaling \$30,428 prior to approval by Metro. The City did not comply with the Guidelines.
<b>Recommendation</b>	We recommend the City establish procedures and internal controls to ensure that approval is obtained from Metro prior to spending on Measure M-funded projects.
<b>Management's Response</b>	The \$30,428 request was submitted on time, but due to staffing shortage, there was an oversight, and it was not properly allocated/broken down between the Administration and Operating Costs.
<b>Finding Corrected During the Audit</b>	Metro Program Manager granted a retroactive approval for the said project on September 21, 2022. No follow up is required.

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
Measure M Local Return Fund  
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs  
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022  
(Continued)**

<b>Finding #2022-002</b>	<b>City of Bell Gardens</b>
<b>Compliance Reference</b>	<p>Section XXV Administrative Section, Expenditure Plan (8/1 Table) of the Measure M Local Return Guidelines state that, "To maintain legal eligibility and meet Measure M LR program compliance requirements, Jurisdiction shall submit to Metro an Expenditure Plan (8/1 Table), annually, by August 1st of each year".</p> <p>"Expenditures Plan (8/1 Table) provides a listing of projects funded with Measure M LR funds along with estimated expenditures for the year. For both operating and capital projects, Part I is to be filled out. Part II is to be filled out for capital projects (projects over \$ 250,000). Metro will provide LR funds to a capital project or program sponsor who submits the required expenditure plan."</p>
<b>Condition</b>	The City submitted its Expenditure Plan (8/1 Table) on August 10, 2021, 9 days after the due date of August 1, 2021.
<b>Cause</b>	The City inadvertently missed the filing deadline.
<b>Effect</b>	The City was not in compliance with the reporting requirements of the Local Return Guidelines.
<b>Recommendation</b>	We recommend the City establish procedures and internal controls to ensure that the Expenditure Plan (8/1 Table) is submitted by August 1 <sup>st</sup> as required by the Guidelines.
<b>Management's Response</b>	Management will ensure that the Expenditure Plan (8/1 Table) is submitted in a timely manner by the due date of August 1 <sup>st</sup> of each fiscal year.
<b>Finding Corrected During the Audit</b>	The City subsequently submitted the Expenditure Plan (8/1 Table). No follow up is required.

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
Measure M Local Return Fund  
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs  
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022  
(Continued)**

<b>Finding #2022-003</b>	<b>City of Calabasas</b>
<b>Compliance Reference</b>	<p>Section XXV Administrative, Reporting Requirements, Expenditure Plan (8/1 Table) of the Measure M Local Return Guidelines states that, "To maintain legal eligibility and meet Measure M LR program compliance requirements, Jurisdiction shall submit to Metro an Expenditure Plan (8/1 Table), annually, by August 1st of each year".</p> <p>"Expenditure Plan (Form M-One) provides a listing of projects funded with Measure M LR funds along with estimated expenditures for the year. For both operating and capital projects, Part I is to be filled out. Part II is to be filled out for capital projects (projects over \$250,000). Metro will provide LR funds to a capital project or program sponsor who submits the required expenditure plan".</p>
<b>Condition</b>	<p>The City claimed expenditures under MMLRF Project Code 640, Direct Administration, totaling \$41,656 prior to approval by Metro.</p> <p>Although we found the expenditures to be eligible for Local Return funding, the project had no prior approval from Metro.</p> <p>This is a repeat finding from prior years' audits.</p>
<b>Cause</b>	The City was in transition staff wise. Information was not properly communicated.
<b>Effect</b>	The City claimed MMLRF expenditures totaling \$41,656 prior to approval by Metro. The City did not comply with the Guidelines.
<b>Recommendation</b>	We recommend the City establish procedures and internal controls to ensure that approval is obtained from Metro prior to spending on Measure M-funded projects.

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
Measure M Local Return Fund  
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs  
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022  
(Continued)**

<b>Finding #2022-003 (Continued)</b>	<b>City of Calabasas</b>
<b>Management's Response</b>	The City agrees with the findings and will continue to work diligently to establish procedures and internal controls to ensure that approval is obtained from Metro prior to spending on any Measure M-funded projects. The City submitted a Budget Request to Metro Program Manager and obtained a retroactive approval of the budgets for said projects on November 22, 2022.
<b>Finding Corrected During the Audit</b>	Metro Program Manager granted a retroactive approval of the said projects. No additional follow up is required.

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
Measure M Local Return Fund  
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs  
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022  
(Continued)**

<b>Finding #2022-004</b>	<b>City of Compton</b>
<b>Compliance Reference</b>	<p>Section XXV Administrative, Expenditure Plan (Form M-One or 8/1 Table) of the Measure M Local Return Guidelines states that, "To maintain legal eligibility and meet Measure M LR program compliance requirements, Jurisdiction shall submit to Metro an Expenditure Plan (Form M-One or 8/1 Table) or its electronic equivalent, annually, by August 1st of each year".</p> <p>"Expenditure Plan (Form M-One or 8/1 Table) provides a listing of projects funded with Measure M LR funds along with estimated expenditures for the year. For both operating and capital projects, Part I is to be filled out. Part II is to be filled out for capital projects (projects over \$250,000). Metro will provide LR funds to a capital project or program sponsor who submits the required expenditure plan".</p>
<b>Condition</b>	<p>The City's issuance of the PCLRF, MRLRF and MMLRF Limited Tax Bonds and the use of the proceeds of the bonds for Street Improvement Projects was approved by Metro before the issuance of the bonds in March 2021. Accordingly, the debt service payments were also approved as an eligible expense under MMLRF. However, to comply with Metro's annual budget approval process and reporting requirement, the City is required to submit a Budget Request or "8/1" Table and include the annual budgets for both bond proceeds project expenditures and debt service payment for approval by Metro. Debt service payments of \$813,333 were not included in the Budget Request or "8/1" Table.</p> <p>This is a repeat finding from prior year's audit in relation to the MMLRF's prior period adjustment to recognize the FY2020/21 debt service payment of \$207,115.</p>
<b>Cause</b>	The City had received approval for the bond issuance from Metro, but was not aware that separate approvals were required for underlying annual project expenditures including debt service payments through the Budget Request or "8/1" Table.
<b>Effect</b>	The City claimed debt service payments totaling \$813,333 prior to approval by Metro. The City did not comply with the Local Return Guidelines.

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
Measure M Local Return Fund  
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs  
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022  
(Continued)**

<b>Finding #2022-004 (Continued)</b>	<b>City of Compton</b>
<b>Recommendation</b>	We recommend the City establish procedures and internal controls to ensure that approval is obtained from Metro prior to spending on Measure M-funded projects.
<b>Management's Response</b>	The City submitted a Budget Request to Metro Program Manager and obtained a retroactive approval of the said project on December 1, 2022.
<b>Finding Corrected During the Audit</b>	Metro Program Manager granted a retroactive approval of the budgets for said project. No additional follow up is required.

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
Measure M Local Return Fund  
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs  
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022  
(Continued)**

<b>Finding #2022-005</b>	<b>City of Montebello</b>
<b>Compliance Reference</b>	<p>Section XXV Administrative, Expenditure Plan (Form M-One) of the Measure M Local Return Program Guidelines state that, "To maintain legal eligibility and meet Measure M LR program compliance requirements, Jurisdiction shall submit to Metro an Expenditure Plan (Form M-One) or its electronic equivalent, annually, by August 1<sup>st</sup> of each year".</p> <p>"Expenditure Plan (Form M-One) provides a listing of projects funded with Measure M LR funds along with estimated expenditures for the year. For both operating and capital projects, Part I is to be filled out. Part II is to be filled out for capital projects (projects over \$250,000). Metro will provide LR funds to a capital project or program sponsor who submits the required expenditure plan".</p>
<b>Condition</b>	<p>The City claimed expenditures for the following MMLRF projects prior to approval by Metro:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Project code 490, Sales Tax Revenue Bonds, totaling \$1,605; and</li> <li>b. Project code 640, Administrative Overhead, totaling \$51,352.</li> </ul> <p>Although we found the expenditures to be eligible for Local Return funding, these projects had no prior approval from Metro.</p> <p>This is a repeat finding from prior year's audit.</p>
<b>Cause</b>	<p>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, 2022.</p>
<b>Effect</b>	<p>The City claimed expenditures totaling \$52,957 prior to approval by Metro. The City did not comply with the Guidelines.</p>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<p>We recommend the City establish procedures and internal controls to ensure that approval is obtained from Metro prior to spending on Measure M-funded projects.</p>

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
Measure M Local Return Fund  
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs  
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022  
(Continued)**

<b>Finding #2022-005 (Continued)</b>	<b>City of Montebello</b>
<b>Management's Response</b>	The City submitted a Budget Request to Metro Program Manager and obtained a retroactive approval of the said projects on July 5, 2022 and August 18, 2022.
<b>Finding Corrected During the Audit</b>	Metro Program Manager granted a retroactive approval of the budgets for said projects. No additional follow up is required.



**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority**  
**Measure M Local Return Fund**  
**Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs**  
**Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022**  
**(Continued)**

<b>Finding #2022-006</b>	<b>City of South Gate</b>
<b>Compliance Reference</b>	<p>Section XXV Administrative Section, Expenditure Plan (8/1 Table) of the Measure M Local Return Guidelines states that, "To maintain legal eligibility and meet Measure M LR program compliance requirements, Jurisdiction shall submit to Metro an Expenditure Plan (8/1 Table), annually, by August 1<sup>st</sup> of each year".</p> <p>"Expenditures Plan (8/1 Table) provides a listing of projects funded with Measure M LR funds along with estimated expenditures for the year. For both operating and capital projects, Part I is to be filled out. Part II is to be filled out for capital projects (projects over \$ 250,000). Metro will provide LR funds to a capital project or program sponsor who submits the required expenditure plan."</p>
<b>Condition</b>	The City submitted its Expenditure Plan (8/1 Table) on August 10, 2021, 9 days after the due date of August 1, 2021.
<b>Cause</b>	The City inadvertently missed the filing deadline.
<b>Effect</b>	The City was not in compliance with the reporting requirements of the Local Return Guidelines.
<b>Recommendation</b>	We recommend the City establish procedures and internal controls to ensure that the Expenditure Plan (8/1 Table) is submitted by August 1 <sup>st</sup> as required by the Guidelines.
<b>Management's Response</b>	Management will ensure that the Expenditure Plan (8/1 Table) is submitted in a timely manner by the due date of August 1 <sup>st</sup> of each fiscal year.
<b>Finding Corrected During the Audit</b>	The City subsequently submitted the Expenditure Plan (8/1 Table). No follow up is required.

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
Measure M Local Return Fund  
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs  
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022  
(Continued)**

<b>Finding #2022-007</b>	<b>City of Vernon</b>
<b>Compliance Reference</b>	<p>Section XXV Administrative Section, Expenditure Plan (8/1 Table) of the Measure M Local Return Guidelines states that, "To maintain legal eligibility and meet Measure M LR program compliance requirements, Jurisdiction shall submit to Metro an Expenditure Plan (8/1 Table), annually, by August 1st of each year".</p> <p>"Expenditures Plan (8/1 Table) provides a listing of projects funded with Measure M LR funds along with estimated expenditures for the year. For both operating and capital projects, Part I is to be filled out. Part II is to be filled out for capital projects (projects over \$ 250,000). Metro will provide LR funds to a capital project or program sponsor who submits the required expenditure plan."</p>
<b>Condition</b>	The City submitted its Expenditure Plan (8/1 Table) on August 10, 2021, 9 days after the due date of August 1, 2021.
<b>Cause</b>	The City inadvertently missed the filing deadline.
<b>Effect</b>	The City was not in compliance with the reporting requirements of the Local Return Guidelines.
<b>Recommendation</b>	We recommend the City establish procedures and internal controls to ensure that the Expenditure Plan (8/1 Table) is submitted by August 1 <sup>st</sup> as required by the Guidelines.
<b>Management's Response</b>	Management will ensure that the Expenditure Plan (8/1 Table) is submitted in a timely manner by the due date of August 1.
<b>Finding Corrected During the Audit</b>	The City subsequently submitted the Expenditure Plan (8/1 Table). No follow up is required.



[www.vasquezcpa.com](http://www.vasquezcpa.com)

Vasquez & Company LLP has over 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](http://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.



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

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

**FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2022**



Simpson & Simpson, LLP  
Certified Public Accountants

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
Measure M Local Return Fund  
Consolidated Audit Report  
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
<b>INDEPENDENT AUDITOR’S REPORT ON COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO MEASURE M ORDINANCE AND MEASURE M LOCAL RETURN GUIDELINES</b>	1
List of Package B 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



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

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

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

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

### Report on Compliance

#### *Opinion*

We have audited the compliance of the forty-nine (49) Cities (the Cities) identified in the List of Package B Jurisdictions, with the types of compliance requirements described in the Measure M Ordinance enacted through a Los Angeles County voter-approved law in November 2016; Measure M Local Return Guidelines, issued by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro), approved by its Board of Directors on June 22, 2017 (collectively, the Guidelines); and the respective Assurance and Understanding Regarding Receipt and Use of Measure M Local Return Funds, executed by Metro and the Cities for the year ended June 30, 2022 (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.

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 M Local Return program for the year ended June 30, 2022.

#### *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 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 Cities' compliance with the compliance requirements referred to above.



The CPA. Never Underestimate The Value.™



### ***Responsibilities of Management for Compliance***

The Cities' management is responsible for each respective City's 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 program agreements applicable to the Cities' Measure M 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 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 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 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 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 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 other instances of noncompliance, which are required to be reported in accordance with the Guidelines and which are described in the accompanying Summary of Compliance Findings (Schedule 1) and Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs (Schedule 2) as Findings # 2022-001 through #2022-011. Our opinion is not modified with respect to these matters.

*Government Auditing Standards* requires the auditor to perform limited procedures on the Cities' responses to the noncompliance findings identified in our compliance audit 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 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 have not been identified. We did not identify any deficiencies in internal control over compliance that we consider to be material weaknesses. However, as discussed below, we did identify certain deficiency in internal control over compliance that we consider to be 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 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. 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 # 2022-004 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 audit are described in the accompanying Summary of Audit Results (Schedule 1 and 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 response.

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.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Simpson &amp; Simpson". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Los Angeles, California  
December 30, 2022

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
Measure M Local Return Fund  
List of Package B Jurisdictions  
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022**

- |                                  |                                   |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 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 GLENDORA             | 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 M Local Return Fund**  
**Compliance Area Tested**  
**Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022**

1. Funds were expended for transportation purposes.
2. Separate Measure M Local Return Account was established.
3. Revenues received including allocations, project generated revenues and interest income was properly credited to the Measure M 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 M-One or electronic equivalent) was submitted on time.
9. Expenditure Report (Form M-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 M 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 (trades, loans, or gifts) were approved by Metro.
16. Accounting procedures, record keeping and documentation are adequate.

## **SUMMARY OF AUDIT RESULTS**

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
Measure M Local Return Fund  
Summary of Compliance Findings  
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022**

The audit of the 49 cities identified in the List of Package B Jurisdictions have resulted in 11 findings. The table below shows a summary of the findings:

<b>Finding</b>	<b># of Findings</b>	<b>Responsible Cities/ Finding Reference</b>	<b>Questioned Costs</b>	<b>Resolved During the Audit</b>
Funds were expended with Metro's approval.	3	Alhambra (#2022-001) Covina (#2022-005) Redondo Beach (#2022-011)	\$ 569,942 252,260 67,264	\$ 569,942 252,260 67,264
Expenditure Plan (Form M-One or electronic equivalent) was submitted on time.	2	Artesia (#2022-002) Glendale (#2022-007)	None None	None None
Expenditure Report (Form M-Two or electronic equivalent) was submitted on time.	6	Artesia (#2022-003) Bradbury (#2022-004) Covina (#2022-006) La Habra Heights (#2022-008) Palmdale (#2022-009) Pasadena (#2022-010)	None None None None None None	None None None None None None
<b>Total Findings and Questioned Costs</b>	<b>11</b>		<b>\$ 889,466</b>	<b>\$ 889,466</b>

Details of the findings are in Schedule 2

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority**  
**Measure M Local Return Fund**  
**Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs**  
**Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022**

Finding #2022-001	City of Alhambra
Compliance Reference	According to Measure M Local Return Guidelines, Section XXV Administrative, Form Submission Timeline, “New, amended, ongoing and carryover projects must file an Expenditure Plan Form M-One by August 1st. In addition, the Audit Requirements, Financial and Compliance Provisions of the section states, “The Measure M 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 the following MMLRF projects were incurred prior to Metro’s approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Project Code 780, Professional Engineering Consulting Services to Advance the 710 N Arterial and I-10 Interchange Improvement Concepts, in the amount of \$559,246.</li> <li>b. Project Code 780, Professional Stakeholder Outreach Consulting Services for 710 North Terminus, in the amount of \$10,696.</li> </ul> <p>However, the City received retroactive project approvals from Metro on November 2, 2022.</p>
Cause	The City's mistakenly made an assumption that the projects were already approved by Metro prior to expenditures being incurred.
Effect	The City did not comply with the Guidelines as expenditures for the MMLRF projects 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 M 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 M Local Return Funds are in accordance with Metro’s approval and the Guidelines.
Management’s Response	The City agrees with this finding. The City will closely monitor that all of the projects are approved and ensure that the expenditures are not incurred prior to Metro's approval.
Corrected During the Audit	Metro Program Manager granted retroactive budget approval of the said projects on November 2, 2022. No follow-up is required.

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
Measure M Local Return Fund  
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs  
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022  
(Continued)**

<b>Finding #2022-002</b>	<b>City of Artesia</b>
Compliance Reference	According to Measure M Local Return Guidelines, Section XXV Administrative: Reporting Requirements - Expenditure Plan (Form M-One), "To maintain legal eligibility and meet Measure M LR program compliance requirements, Jurisdictions shall submit to Metro an Expenditure Plan (Form M-One), annually, by August 1 of each year."
Condition	The City did not meet the August 1, 2021 deadline for submitting the Expenditure Plan in the LRMS. However, the City updated the information in the LRMS on August 9, 2021.
Cause	This was due to an oversight on the part of the City.
Effect	The City did not comply with the Measure M 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 is in compliant with Metro's Guidelines.
Management's Response	In the future, management will ensure the Expenditure Plan is submitted before the deadline.
Corrected During the Audit	The City subsequently entered the required information in the LRMS on August 9, 2021. No follow up is required.

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority**  
**Measure M Local Return Fund**  
**Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs**  
**Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022**  
**(Continued)**

<b>Finding #2022-003</b>	<b>City of Artesia</b>
Compliance Reference	According to Measure M Local Return Guidelines, Section XXV, Administrative, "The submittal of an Expenditure Report (Form M-Two) is also required to maintain legal eligibility and meet Measure M LR program compliance requirements. Jurisdictions shall submit a Form M-Two, to Metro annually, by October 15th (following the conclusion of the fiscal year)."
Condition	The City did not meet the October 15, 2022 deadline for submitting the Annual Expenditure Report in the LRMS. Instead, the City submitted the information in the LRMS on December 2, 2022.
Cause	This was an oversight on the part of the City.
Effect	The City did not comply with the Measure M 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	In the future management will ensure the Expenditure Report is submitted before the deadline.
Corrected During the Audit	The City subsequently entered the required information in the LRMS on December 2, 2022. No follow up is required.



**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
Measure M Local Return Fund  
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs  
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022  
(Continued)**

<b>Finding #2022-004</b>	<b>City of Bradbury</b>
Compliance Reference	According to Measure M Local Return Guidelines, Section XXV, Administrative, "The submittal of an Expenditure Report (Form M-Two) is also required to maintain legal eligibility and meet Measure M LR program compliance requirements. Jurisdictions shall submit a Form M-Two, to Metro annually, by October 15th (following the conclusion of the fiscal year)."
Condition	The City did not meet the October 15, 2022 deadline for submitting the Annual Expenditure Report in the Local Return Management System (LRMS). Instead, the City submitted the information in the LRMS on November 4, 2022.  This is a repeat finding from fiscal year 2021.
Cause	It was due to an oversight by the City's finance department.
Effect	The City did not comply with the Measure M 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 new Finance Director during fiscal year 2022 and was unaware of the compliance requirement of Local Return Funds.
Corrected During the Audit	The City subsequently entered the required information in the LRMS on November 4, 2022. No follow-up is required.

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority**  
**Measure M Local Return Fund**  
**Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs**  
**Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022**  
**(Continued)**

Finding #2022-005	City of Covina
Compliance Reference	According to Measure M Local Return Guidelines, Section XXV Administrative, Form Submission Timeline, “New, amended, ongoing and carryover projects must file an Expenditure Plan Form M-One by August 1st. In addition, the Audit Requirements, Financial and Compliance Provisions of the section states, “The Measure M 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 the following MMLRF projects were incurred prior to Metro’s approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Project Code 302, Azusa Avenue Traffic Signal Rehabilitation, in the amount of \$42,260.</li> <li>b. Project Code 304, Traffic Signal Maintenance, in the amount of \$210,000.</li> </ul> <p>However, the City received retroactive project approvals from Metro on October 13, 2022.</p>
Cause	Expenditures were reallocated to MMLRF to make better use of available transportation funding. Changes were made during the mid-year budget process that were not reported to Metro until October 13, 2022.
Effect	The City did not comply with the Guidelines as expenditures for the MMLRF projects 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 M Local Return projects, and properly enter the budgeted amount for each project in the LRMS and submit before the requested due date so that the City’s expenditures of Measure M Local Return Funds are in accordance with Metro’s approval and the Guidelines.
Management’s Response	The City’s Finance and Public Works departments will work together to ensure that any budget changes are communicated to Metro immediately so that all projects have the necessary budget approvals.
Corrected During the Audit	Metro Program Manager granted retroactive budget approval of the said projects on October 13, 2022. No follow-up is required.

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority**  
**Measure M Local Return Fund**  
**Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs**  
**Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022**  
**(Continued)**

<b>Finding #2022-006</b>	<b>City of Covina</b>
Compliance Reference	According to Measure M Local Return Guidelines, Section XXV, Administrative, "The submittal of an Expenditure Report (Form M-Two) is also required to maintain legal eligibility and meet Measure M LR program compliance requirements. Jurisdictions shall submit a Form M-Two, to Metro annually, by October 15th (following the conclusion of the fiscal year)."
Condition	The City did not meet the October 15, 2022 deadline for submitting the Annual Expenditure Report to Metro by entering the expenditures in the LRMS. The City subsequently reported the MMLRF expenditures in the LRMS on October 20, 2022.
Cause	The City inadvertently missed the filing deadline.
Effect	The City did not comply with the Measure M Local Return Guidelines.
Recommendation	We recommend that the City establish procedures to ensure that the Expenditure Report is properly prepared and submitted before the due date of October 15th by reporting the annual expenditures in the LRMS so that the City's expenditures of the MMLRF will be in accordance with Metro's approval and the Guidelines.
Management's Response	The City's Finance and Public Works departments will work together to ensure that the Expenditure Report will be submitted to Metro in a timely manner.
Corrected During the Audit	The City subsequently reported the annual expenditures on October 20, 2022. No follow-up is required.

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority**  
**Measure M Local Return Fund**  
**Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs**  
**Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022**  
**(Continued)**

<b>Finding #2022-007</b>	<b>City of Glendale</b>
Compliance Reference	According to Measure M Local Return Guidelines, Section XXV Administrative: Reporting Requirements - Expenditure Plan (Form M-One), "To maintain legal eligibility and meet Measure M LR program compliance requirements, Jurisdictions shall submit to Metro an Expenditure Plan (Form M-One), annually, by August 1 of each year."
Condition	The City did not meet the August 1, 2021 deadline for submitting the Expenditure Plan in the LRMS. However, the City updated the information in the LRMS on August 10, 2021.
Cause	This was due to an oversight on the part of the City.
Effect	The City did not comply with the Measure M 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 is in compliant with Metro's Guidelines.
Management's Response	In the future management will ensure the Expenditure Plan is submitted before the deadline.
Corrected During the Audit	The City subsequently entered the required information in the LRMS on August 10, 2021. No follow up is required.

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
Measure M Local Return Fund  
Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs  
Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022  
(Continued)**

<b>Finding #2022-008</b>	<b>City of La Habra Heights</b>
Compliance Reference	According to Measure M Local Return Guidelines, Section XXV, Administrative, "The submittal of an Expenditure Report (Form M-Two) is also required to maintain legal eligibility and meet Measure M LR program compliance requirements. Jurisdictions shall submit a Form M-Two, to Metro annually, by October 15th (following the conclusion of the fiscal year)."
Condition	The City did not meet the October 15, 2022 deadline for submitting the Annual Expenditure Report in the Local Return Management System (LRMS). Instead, the City submitted the information in the LRMS on October 19, 2022.
Cause	This was an oversight on the part of the City.
Effect	The City did not comply with the Measure M 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	In the future, management will ensure the Annual Expenditure Report is submitted before the deadline.
Corrected During the Audit	The City subsequently entered the required information in the LRMS on October 19, 2022. No follow up is required.

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority**  
**Measure M Local Return Fund**  
**Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs**  
**Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022**  
**(Continued)**

<b>Finding #2022-009</b>	<b>City of Palmdale</b>
Compliance Reference	According to Measure M Local Return Guidelines, Section XXV, Administrative, "The submittal of an Expenditure Report (Form M-Two) is also required to maintain legal eligibility and meet Measure M LR program compliance requirements. Jurisdictions shall submit a Form M-Two, to Metro annually, by October 15th (following the conclusion of the fiscal year)."
Condition	The City did not meet the October 15, 2022 deadline for submitting the Annual Expenditure Report in the Local Return Management System (LRMS). Instead, the City submitted the information in the LRMS on October 20, 2022.
Cause	This was an oversight on the part of the City.
Effect	The City did not comply with the Measure M 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 concurred with the finding.
Corrected During the Audit	The City subsequently entered the required information in the LRMS on October 20, 2022. No follow up is required.

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority**  
**Measure M Local Return Fund**  
**Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs**  
**Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022**  
**(Continued)**

<b>Finding #2022-010</b>	<b>City of Pasadena</b>
Compliance Reference	According to Measure M Local Return Guidelines, Section XXV, Administrative, "The submittal of an Expenditure Report (Form M-Two) is also required to maintain legal eligibility and meet Measure M LR program compliance requirements. Jurisdictions shall submit a Form M-Two, to Metro annually, by October 15th (following the conclusion of the fiscal year)."
Condition	The City did not meet the October 15, 2022 deadline for submitting the Annual Expenditure Report in the LRMS. Instead, the City submitted the information in the LRMS on October 20, 2022.
Cause	This was an oversight on the part of the City.
Effect	The City did not comply with the Measure M 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	In the future, management will ensure the Expenditure Report is submitted before the deadline.
Corrected During the Audit	The City subsequently entered the required information in the LRMS on October 20, 2022. No follow up is required.

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority**  
**Measure M Local Return Fund**  
**Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs**  
**Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022**  
**(Continued)**

<b>Finding #2022-011</b>	<b>City of Redondo Beach</b>
Compliance Reference	According to Measure M Local Return Guidelines, Section XXV Administrative, Form Submission Timeline, “New, amended, ongoing and carryover projects must file an Expenditure Plan Form M-One by August 1st.” In addition, the Audit Requirements, Financial and Compliance Provisions of the section states, “The Measure M 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 MMLRF’s Project Code 725, Citywide Curb Ramp Improvements, in the amount of \$67,264 were incurred prior to Metro’s approval. However, the City subsequently received an approved budget amount of \$85,000 from Metro for the MMLRF project on October 14, 2022.
Cause	This was an oversight on the part of the City.
Effect	The City did not comply with the Guidelines as expenditures for the MMLRF project were incurred prior to Metro’s approval.
Recommendation	We recommend that the City establish procedures to ensure that the City obtains approval from Metro prior to implementing any MMLRF projects, and properly enter the budgeted amount for each project in the LRMS and submit before the requested due date so that the City’s expenditures of MMLRF 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 MMLRF projects.
Corrected During the Audit	On October 14, 2022, the City received a retroactive approved budget amount of \$85,000 from Metro for the MMLRF project. No follow-up is required.



**FISCAL YEAR 2022  
MEASURE M  
REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES AUDIT  
WITH  
INTERNAL CONTROLS AND COMPLIANCE REPORT**

**P R E S E N T A T I O N T O**

**MEASURE M INDEPENDENT TAXPAYER OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**

**MARCH 1, 2023**



*2355 Crenshaw Blvd., Suite 150  
Torrance, CA 90501  
PH 310.792.4640*

# Contents

- Auditor and LACMTA Management Responsibilities
- Summary of Audit Results
- Financial Highlights
- Required Communications
- Management Letter Comments

# Responsibilities

## ❑ LACMTA Management Responsibilities

- Preparation of the Schedule of Measure M Revenues and Expenditures.
- Design, implementation and maintenance of internal control – free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

## ❑ Auditor's Responsibilities

- To express an opinion on the fair presentation on the Schedule of Measure M Revenues and Expenditures based on our audit.
- To express an opinion on compliance with the *Los Angeles County Traffic Improvement Plan* (Measure M Ordinance).

# Summary of Audit Results

- Schedule of Measure M Revenues and Expenditures Audit
  - Unmodified opinion or clean opinion.
- No internal control material weaknesses over financial reporting identified.
- No significant internal control deficiencies over compliance identified.
- LACMTA complied with the *Los Angeles County Traffic Improvement Plan (Measure M Ordinance)*

# Financial Highlights

- Sales tax revenue increased by \$178.7 million compared to prior year (19.6% change from prior year).
- Actual expenditures increased by \$129.4 million compared to prior year (50.6% change from prior year) due primarily to an increase in bus transportation subsidies.
- Transfers out decreased by \$368.1 million compared to prior year (-59.0% change from prior year). Decrease was mainly attributed to lower operating subsidy transfers to Enterprise Fund for bus and rail operations and decrease in transfers to Transportation System and Mobility Improvement Program.
- Actual sales tax revenue was more than budgeted by \$224.9 million.
- Actual expenditures was more than budgeted by \$2.6 million mainly due to more allocations requested by cities/agencies on local return subsidies.
- Actual transfers out was less than budgeted by \$393.3 million mainly due to capital project costs coming in less than budgeted amounts.
- Measure M fund at June 30, 2022 had an excess of revenues over expenditures and other financing uses of \$439.0 million, increasing Measure M fund balance from \$672.4 million to \$1.11 billion at June 30, 2022.

# Required Communications

## Items to be Communicated

### Auditor's Responsibilities Under Generally Accepted Auditing Standards

- To express an opinion on the Schedule of Measure M Revenues and Expenditures.
- To provide reasonable, not absolute, assurance of detecting material misstatements.
- To gain a basic understanding of the internal control policies and procedures to design an effective and efficient audit approach.
- To inform LACMTA of any illegal acts that we become aware of.
  - None

# Required Communications (Continued)

- Adoption/Change in accounting
  - None
- Significant or unusual transactions
  - None
- Alternative treatments discussed with management
  - None
- Significant issues discussed with management
  - None
- Difficulties encountered in performing the audit
  - We encountered no difficulties in dealing with management in performing or conducting the audit.

# Required Communications (Continued)

- Consultations with other accountants
  - To our knowledge, no such consultation has occurred.
- Discussions held prior to retention
  - No major issues were discussed as a condition to our retention.
- Disagreements with management
  - Professional standards define a disagreement with management as a financial accounting, reporting, or auditing matter, whether or not resolved to our satisfaction, that could be significant to the Schedule of Measure M Revenues and Expenditures or the auditor's report.
    - No such disagreements occurred.
- Management representation
  - We requested certain representations from management which are included in the management representation letter.



## 2023 Management Letter Comments

- There are no management letter comments.

## Audited Financial Statements for Measure M Special Revenue Fund

- Included in LACMTA's June 30, 2022 Annual Comprehensive Financial Report (ACFR)

# BCA Watson Rice LLP

## Audit Engagement Team

- Rustico Cabilin, Engagement Partner ([rcabilin@bcawr.com](mailto:rcabilin@bcawr.com))
- Helen Chu, Quality Control Partner ([hcu@bcawr.com](mailto:hcu@bcawr.com))
- Lisa Reason, Senior Auditor ([lreason@bcawr.com](mailto:lreason@bcawr.com))
- Kristen Reyes, Staff Auditor ([kreyes@bcawr.com](mailto:kreyes@bcawr.com))

# QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

**Measure M Local Return Fund Audit Results  
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2022  
(Package B)**

**Simpson & Simpson, LLP**



Measure M Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee Meeting  
Date: March 1, 2023

# Agenda

- ❖ Presenter: Etta Hur, CPA, Partner
  - Background
  - Summary of Findings
  - Analysis of Measure M Audit Results
  - S&S Contact Information
  - Questions



# Background



# Simpson and Simpson, LLP

- We have audited the compliance of the 49 cities (49 Jurisdictions under Package B).

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 GLENDORA	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	



# Simpson and Simpson, LLP

- We conducted our audits of compliance in accordance with the auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America, the standards applicable to financial audits contained in government auditing standards, and the compliance requirements described in the Measure M Ordinance, the Measure M Local Return Guidelines and the respective Assurances and Understandings Regarding Receipt and Use of Measure M Local Return Funds.





# Summary of Findings



# Summary of Findings

- ❖ We performed all 49 jurisdictions' audits.
  - Total dollar amounts associated with the findings have increased from \$675,503 in FY2021 to \$889,466 in the FY2022 compliance audit.
  - Total questioned costs of \$889,466 is about 0.7% of the FY2022 Measure M allocations of \$129,001,382 to jurisdictions under Package B.
  - \$889,466 of the questioned cost relates to funds expended on Measure M eligible projects prior approval from Metro and was resolved during the audit.
  - We identified 11 non-compliance findings which includes the following:
    - 1 significant deficiency (City of Bradbury)

We will explain the specific conditions for the significant deficiency in internal control over Compliance as we present each finding.



# Summary of Findings (Cont.)

Finding	# of Findings	Responsible Cities/ Finding Reference	Questioned Costs	Resolved During the Audit
Funds were expended with Metro's approval.	3	Alhambra (#2022-001) Covina (#2022-005) Redondo Beach (#2022-011)	\$ 569,942 252,260 67,264	\$ 569,942 252,260 67,264
Expenditure Plan (Form M-One or electronic equivalent) was submitted on time.	2	Artesia (#2022-002) Glendale (#2022-007)	None None	None None



# Summary of Findings (Cont.)

Finding	# of Findings	Responsible Cities/ Finding Reference	Questioned Costs	Resolved During the Audit
Expenditure Report (Form M-Two or electronic equivalent) was submitted on time.	6	Artesia (#2022-003) Bradbury (#2022-004) Covina (#2022-006) La Habrá Heights (#2022-008) Palmdale (#2022-009) Pasadena (#2022-010)	None None None None None None	None None None None None None
<b>Total Findings and Questioned Cost</b>	<b>11</b>		<b>\$ 889,466</b>	<b>\$ 889,466</b>



# Analysis of Measure M Audit Results



# Material Weakness and Significant Deficiency In Internal Controls over Compliance

➤ **One (1) significant deficiency:**


**City of Bradbury (Finding #2022-004):**

- The City did not meet the October 15, 2022 deadline for submitting the Annual Expenditure Report in the Local Return Management System (LRMS).
- This is a repeat finding from the prior fiscal year.
- The City has a new Finance Director during fiscal year 2022 and was unaware of the compliance requirement of Local Return Funds.
- Resolved During the Audit: The City subsequently entered the required information in the LRMS on November 4, 2022.



# Revenue and Expenditures of 49 Jurisdictions

FY 2022 & FY 2021 Revenues and Expenditures



# Simpson & Simpson CPAs

## Contact information

Team member	Contact information
<b>Grace Yuen</b> Lead Engagement Partner	Email: <a href="mailto:gyuen@simpsonllp.com">gyuen@simpsonllp.com</a>
<b>Etta Hur</b> Engagement Partner	Email: <a href="mailto:ehur@simpsonllp.com">ehur@simpsonllp.com</a>
<b>Melba Simpson</b> Quality Control Partner	Email: <a href="mailto:msimpson@simpsonllp.com">msimpson@simpsonllp.com</a>
<b>Austine Cho</b> Audit Senior Manager	Email: <a href="mailto:acho@simpsonllp.com">acho@simpsonllp.com</a>
<b>Samuel Qiu</b> Managing Partner (SBE)	Email: <a href="mailto:samq@qiuaccountancy.com">samq@qiuaccountancy.com</a>
<b>Dulce Kapuno</b> Audit Manager (SBE)	Email: <a href="mailto:dulcek@qiuaccountancy.com">dulcek@qiuaccountancy.com</a>





# Questions





**Metro**<sup>®</sup>

**PRESENTATION TO THE MEASURE M  
INDEPENDENT TAXPAYER  
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE  
MEASURE M LOCAL RETURN FUNDS  
March 1, 2023**

# / AGENDA

- Scope of the Audits
- Levels of Assurance, Compliance Criteria and Auditing Standards Utilized
- Revenue and Expenditures of the County of Los Angeles and 39 Cities
- Overview of the Audit Results
- Details of Audit Results
- Material Weaknesses and Significant Deficiencies in Internal Control over Compliance
- Required Communications to the Measure M Oversight Committee
- Q&A
- Contact Information

# SCOPE OF THE AUDITS

# / SCOPE OF THE AUDITS


Financial and Compliance Audits of Measure M Local Return Funds held by the County of Los Angeles and 39 Cities under Package A

- |                          |                     |                   |                      |
|--------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| 1. County of Los Angeles | 11. Compton         | 21. Irwindale     | 31. Rosemead         |
| 2. Agoura Hills          | 12. Cudahy          | 22. La Puente     | 32. San Fernando     |
| 3. Azusa                 | 13. Culver City     | 23. Lawndale      | 33. Santa Fe Springs |
| 4. Baldwin Park          | 14. El Monte        | 24. Lynwood       | 34. Santa Monica     |
| 5. Bell                  | 15. Gardena         | 25. Malibu        | 35. South El Monte   |
| 6. Bell Gardens          | 16. Hawthorne       | 26. Maywood       | 36. South Gate       |
| 7. Beverly Hills         | 17. Hidden Hills    | 27. Montebello    | 37. Vernon           |
| 8. Calabasas             | 18. Huntington Park | 28. Monterey Park | 38. Walnut           |
| 9. Carson                | 19. Industry        | 29. Pico Rivera   | 39. West Hollywood   |
| 10. Commerce             | 20. Inglewood       | 30. Pomona        | 40. Westlake Village |



# LEVELS OF ASSURANCE, COMPLIANCE CRITERIA AND AUDITING STANDARDS UTILIZED

# / LEVELS OF ASSURANCE, COMPLIANCE CRITERIA AND AUDITING STANDARDS UTILIZED




# REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES AND 39 CITIES



# REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES AND 39 CITIES

## FY 2022 Revenues and Expenditures



# OVERVIEW OF THE AUDIT RESULTS

# / OVERVIEW OF THE AUDIT RESULTS

## FY 2022 Summary of Audit Results

- Dollars associated with the findings have increased from \$397,549 in FY2021 to \$938,374 in FY2022 audit.
- **This represents** about 2.6% of the total Measure M FY2022 allocations of \$36,357,052 to the County of Los Angeles and the 39 cities under Package A.

## Questioned Costs

- The questioned cost of \$938,374 relates to Measure M funds expended on eligible projects prior to Metro's approval.

**All of these were resolved during the audit.**

# DETAILS OF AUDIT RESULTS

# / DETAILS OF AUDIT RESULTS

Our findings are as follows:

## A. Funds were expended prior to Metro’s approval.

- Compliance Reference: Section XXV of the Measure M Local Return Program Guidelines, Administrative, Expenditure Plan (Form M-One or electronic equivalent) states that, “To maintain legal eligibility and meet Measure M LR program compliance requirements, Jurisdiction shall submit to Metro an Expenditure Plan (Form M-One), annually, by August 1st of each year”.
- Number of cities involved: 4 of 39 cities
- Questioned costs for 2022:

	Total Expenditures Claimed for 2022	Questioned	Resolved During the Audit	Report Reference
1. Bell	\$ 46,847	\$ 30,428	\$ 30,428	Finding #2022-001, Page 8
2. Calabasas	249,934	41,656	41,656	Finding #2022-003, Page 10
3. Compton	844,843	813,333	813,333	Finding #2022-004, Page 12
3. Montebello	2,398,739	52,957	52,957	Finding #2022-005, Page 14
	<u>\$ 3,540,363</u>	<u>\$ 938,374</u>	<u>\$ 938,374</u>	

# / DETAILS OF AUDIT RESULTS

## B. Expenditure Plan (Form M-One or electronic equivalent was not submitted timely.)

- Compliance Reference: Section XXV of the Measure M Local Return Program Guidelines, Administrative, Expenditure Plan (Form M-One or electronic equivalent) states that, “To maintain legal eligibility and meet Measure M LR program compliance requirements, Jurisdiction shall submit to Metro an Expenditure Plan (Form M-One), annually, by August 1st of each year”.
- Number of cities involved: 3 of 39 cities
  - **City of Bell Gardens (Finding #2022-002, Page 9)**
  - **City of South Gate (Finding #2022-006, Page 16)**
  - **City of Vernon (Finding #2022-007, Page 17)**
- Questioned costs for 2022: **None**

# MATERIAL WEAKNESSES AND SIGNIFICANT DEFICIENCIES IN INTERNAL CONTROL OVER COMPLIANCE

# / MATERIAL WEAKNESSES AND SIGNIFICANT DEFICIENCIES IN INTERNAL CONTROL OVER COMPLIANCE

## (1) Material Weakness (repeat finding)

City of Calabasas

Finding #2022-003

- The City claimed expenditures under MMLRF Project Code 640, Direct Administration, totaling \$41,656 prior to Metro's approval.
- This is a repeat finding from prior years' audit.



# / MATERIAL WEAKNESSES AND SIGNIFICANT DEFICIENCIES IN INTERNAL CONTROL OVER COMPLIANCE

## (2) Significant Deficiencies (Repeat Findings):

City of Compton

Finding #2022-004

- The City claimed expenditures under MMLRF Project Code 715, Bond Payment for Street Road Improvements, totaling \$813,333 prior to Metro's approval.
- This is a repeat finding from prior year's audit in relation to the prior period adjustment to recognize the bond payment of \$207,115.

City of Montebello

Finding #2022-005

- The City claimed expenditures of \$52,957 under the following MMLRF project prior to Metro's approval.
  - a. Project code 490, Sales Tax Revenue Bonds, totaling \$1,605; and
  - b. Project code 640, Administrative Overhead, totaling \$51,352
- This is a repeat finding from prior year's audit

# REQUIRED COMMUNICATIONS TO THE MEASURE M OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

# / REQUIRED COMMUNICATIONS TO THE MEASURE M OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

*Professional standards require independent accountants to discuss with those in charge of governance matters of importance which arise during the course of their audit as well as significant matters concerning the audited jurisdictions' internal controls and the preparation and composition of the financial statements. We therefore present the following information required to be communicated to the Measure M Oversight Committee based upon the results of our audit of the Measure M Local Return Funds of the County of Los Angeles and the 39 cities.*

# / REQUIRED COMMUNICATIONS TO THE MEASURE M OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE, CONTINUED

## Management's Responsibility

Management of the jurisdictions has primary responsibility for the accounting principles used, their consistency, application and clarity.

## Consultations with Other Accountants

We are not aware of any consultations by management of the jurisdictions with other accountants about accounting or auditing matters.

## Difficulties with Management

We did not encounter any difficulties with management of the jurisdictions while performing our audit procedures.

# / REQUIRED COMMUNICATIONS TO THE MEASURE M OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE, CONTINUED

---

## Disagreements with Management

We encountered no disagreements with management of the jurisdictions on financial accounting and reporting matters.

---

## Significant Accounting Policies

The jurisdictions' significant accounting policies are appropriate and were consistently applied.

---

## Controversial Issues

No significant or unusual transactions or accounting policies in controversial or emerging areas for which there is lack of authoritative guidance or consensus were identified.

# / REQUIRED COMMUNICATIONS TO THE MEASURE M OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE, CONTINUED

---

## Irregularities, Fraud or Illegal Acts

No irregularities, fraud or illegal acts came to our attention as a result of our audit procedures.

---

## Management Representations

The jurisdictions provided us with a signed copies of the management representation letters prior to issuance of our auditor's opinions.

# QUESTIONS

# / CONTACT INFORMATION

**Vasquez + Company LLP** has over 50 years of experience in performing audit, accounting, and consulting services for all types of private companies, nonprofit organizations, 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](http://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.**



**Cristy Canieda, CPA, CGMA**  
213-873-1720 OFFICE  
[ccanieda@vasquezcpa.com](mailto:ccanieda@vasquezcpa.com)

**Roger Martinez, CPA**  
213-873-1703 OFFICE  
[ram@vasquezcpa.com](mailto:ram@vasquezcpa.com)

**Marialyn Labastilla, CPA, CGMA**  
213-873-1738 OFFICE  
[mlabastilla@vasquezcpa.com](mailto:mlabastilla@vasquezcpa.com)

[www.vasquez.cpa](http://www.vasquez.cpa)

Los Angeles \ San Diego \ Irvine \ Sacramento \  
Fresno \ Phoenix \ Las Vegas \ Manila, PH



\ 213-873-1700  
\ solutions@vasquezcpa.com

**Thank you for your time and attention.**