#### CITY OF PARAMOUNT ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE

PROPOSITION A LOCAL RETURN FUND
PROPOSITION C LOCAL RETURN FUND
MEASURE R LOCAL RETURN FUND
TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT
ARTICLE 3 FUND

FOR THE FISCAL YEARS ENDED JUNE 30, 2016 AND 2015





Simpson & Simpson, LLP Certified Public Accountants

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

FINANCIAL SECTION	PAGE
Independent Auditor's Report Proposition A Local Return Fund: Basic Financial Statements:	1
Balance Sheets	4
Statements of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance Supplementary Information:	5
Schedule of Expenditures – Actual and Metro Approved Project Budget Schedule of Capital Assets	6 7
Proposition C Local Return Fund: Basic Financial Statements:	
Basic Financial Statements:  Balance Sheets	8
Statements of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance Supplementary Information:	9
Schedule of Expenditures – Actual and Metro Approved Project Budget	10
Schedule of Capital Assets Measure R Local Return Fund:	11
Basic Financial Statements:	10
Balance Sheets	12
Statements of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance Supplementary Information:	13
Schedule of Expenditures – Actual and Metro Approved Project Budget Schedule of Capital Assets	14 15
Transportation Development Act Article 3 Fund: Basic Financial Statements:	
Balance Sheets	16
Statements of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance Supplementary Information:	17
Schedule of Transportation Development Act Allocation for Specific Projects	18
Notes to Financial Statements	19
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>	23
COMPLIANCE SECTION	
Independent Auditor's Report On Compliance	25
Compliance Matrix	27
Schedule of Findings and Recommendations	30
EXIT CONFERENCE	31





SIMPSON & SIMPSON CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS FOUNDING PARTNERS

MELBA W. SIMPSON, CPA

#### **Independent Auditor's Report**

To the Honorable Members of the City Council of the City of Paramount, California and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

#### **Report on the Financial Statements**

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of the Proposition A Local Return Fund (PALRF), Proposition C Local Return Fund (PCLRF), Measure R Local Return Fund (MRLRF), and Transportation Development Act Article 3 (TDAA3F) Fund of the City of Paramount, California (City) as of and for the year ended June 30, 2016, and the related notes to the financial statements, as listed in the table of contents.

#### Management's Responsibility for the Financial Statements

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

#### Auditor's Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audit. 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. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement.

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. The procedures selected depend on the auditor's judgment, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to fraud or error. In making those risk assessments, the auditor considers internal control relevant to the entity's preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements 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 entity's internal control. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. An audit also includes evaluating the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the financial statements.

We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our audit opinions.





#### **Opinions**

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the respective financial position of the PALRF, PCLRF, MRLRF and TDAA3F of the City of Paramount, California, as of June 30, 2016, and the respective changes in their financial position for the year then ended in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

#### Other Matter

The financial statements of the PALRF, PCLRF, MRLRF, and TDAA3F as of and for the year ended June 30, 2015, were audited by other auditors, whose report, dated December 16, 2015 expressed an unmodified opinion on those statements.

#### **Emphasis of Matter**

As discussed in Note 2, the financial statements present only the PALRF, PCLRF, MRLRF and TDAA3F and do not purport to, and do not, present fairly the financial position of the City of PARAMOUNT, California, as of June 30, 2016 and 2015, and the changes in financial position thereof for the years then ended in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. Our opinion is not modified with respect to this matter.

#### Supplementary Information

Our audit was conducted for the purpose of forming opinions on the financial statements that collectively comprise the City of Paramount, California's PALRF, PCLRF, MRLRF, and TDAA3F Fund financial statements as a whole. The accompanying supplementary information as listed in the table of contents is presented for the purposes of additional analysis and is not a required part of the financial statements. The supplementary information is the responsibility of management and was derived from and relates directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the financial statements.

The supplementary information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the financial statements and certain additional procedures, including comparing and reconciling such information directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the financial statements or to the financial statements themselves, and other additional procedures in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. In our opinion, the supplementary information is fairly stated in all material respects, in relation to the financial statements as a whole.

2



#### Other Reporting Required by Governmental Auditing Standards

In accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*, we have issued our report dated December 5, 2016, on our consideration of the City of Paramount's internal control over financial reporting and on our tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements and other matters. The purpose of that report is to describe the scope of our testing of internal control over financial reporting and compliance and the results of that testing, not to provide an opinion on internal control over financial reporting or on compliance. That report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* in considering the City's internal control over financial reporting and compliance.

Los Angeles, California

Simpson & Simpson

December 5, 2016

#### PROPOSITION A LOCAL RETURN FUND

#### BALANCE SHEETS JUNE 30

		2016		2015
ASSETS			-	_
Cash and investments	\$	473,774	\$	358,813
Due from metro		24		-
Interest receivable	,	583	-	233
Total assets	\$	474,381	\$	359,046
LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCE				
Liabilities				
Accounts payable		97,887	-	58,145
Total liabilities	\$	97,887	\$	58,145
Fund Balance				
Restricted		376,494	-	300,901
Total fund balance		376,494	-	300,901
Total liabilities and fund balance	\$	474,381	\$	359,046

#### PROPOSITION A LOCAL RETURN FUND

# STATEMENTS OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES, AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCE

#### For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30

	2016	2015
REVENUES		
Proposition A	\$ 993,684	\$ 966,041
Interest income	1,671	780
Project generated revenue (Note 7)	95,924	107,578
Total revenues	1,091,279	1,074,399
EXPENDITURES		
Various projects	1,015,686	996,371
Total expenditures	1,015,686	996,371
Excess of revenues over expenditures	75,593	78,028
Fund balance at beginning of year	300,901	222,873
Fund balance at end of year	\$ 376,494	\$ 300,901

#### PROPOSITION A LOCAL RETURN FUND

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES ACTUAL AND METRO APPROVED PROJECT BUDGET

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2016 (With Comparative Actual Amount for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2015)

		_					
		_	Variance			Variance	
Project			Metro			Favorable	2015
Code	Project Name		Budget	Actual	<u>(U</u>	Infavorable)	Actual
110-01	Community Level Transit	\$	721,000 \$	678,270	\$	42,730 \$	659,646
110-04	Long Beach Transit Subsidy		11,450	11,453		(3)	9,906
140-02	Recreation Transit		44,000	12,784		31,216	12,017
170-01	Bus Stop Maintenance		30,000	22,275		7,725	22,833
220-01	Railroad ROW Patrol		85,000	82,927		2,073	81,278
240-05	Subsidized Taxi Services		48,000	26,687		21,313	37,746
270-10	Phase II		-	-		-	-
270-11	Eco-Rapid Transit (previously Orange						
	Line) Feasibility Study (IV)		25,000	21,433		3,567	16,433
480-03	Prop A Administration	_	200,000	159,857	_	40,143	156,512
	Total expenditures	\$_	1,164,450 \$	1,015,686	\$_	148,764 \$	996,371

#### PROPOSITION A LOCAL RETURN FUND

# SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION SCHEDULE OF CAPITAL ASSETS

June 30, 2016

Date		Balance				Balance
Acquired	Description	7/1/2015	Additions	Deletions		6/30/2016
2002	Challenger 16 Passenger Bus \$	73,350 \$	- \$	-	\$	73,350
2005	El Dorado EZ Rider II (30 passenger bus)	209,276	-	-		209,276
2007	El Dorado EZ Rider - Unit 599	101,993	-	-		101,993
2008	El Dorado Aerotech - Unit 598	70,374	-	-		70,374
2009	El Dorado EZ Rider - Unit 599	200,000	-	-		200,000
2011	2010 Starcraft Allstar 25' - Unit 241	34,311	-	-		34,311
2011	2010 Starcraft Allstar 25' - Unit 242	34,311	-	-		34,311
2011	2008 El Dorado Passport	36,739	-	-		36,739
	_			_		-
	Total \$	760,354 \$	\$		\$_	760,354

#### PROPOSITION C LOCAL RETURN FUND

#### BALANCE SHEETS JUNE 30

	_	2016	_	2015
ASSETS			-	
Cash and investments	\$	468,155	\$	1,189,134
Interest receivable	_	577		833
Total assets	\$ =	468,732	\$	1,189,967
LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCE				
Liabilities				
Accounts payable	_	4,469		239,755
Total liabilities	\$ _	4,469	\$	239,755
Fund Balance				
Restricted	_	464,263	-	950,212
Total fund balance	-	464,263	-	950,212
Total liabilities and fund balance	\$ _	468,732	\$	1,189,967

#### PROPOSITION C LOCAL RETURN FUND

# STATEMENTS OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES, AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCE

#### For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30

	2016	2015
REVENUES		
Proposition C	\$ 826,647	\$ 804,069
Interest income	3,023	2,673
Total revenues	829,670	806,742
EXPENDITURES		
Various projects	1,315,619	686,850
Total expenditures	1,315,619	686,850
(Deficiency) excess of revenues over expenditures	(485,949)	119,892
Fund balance at beginning of year	950,212	830,320
Fund balance at end of year	\$ 464,263	\$ 950,212

#### PROPOSITION C LOCAL RETURN FUND

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES ACTUAL AND METRO APPROVED PROJECT BUDGET

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2016 (With Comparative Actual Amount for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2015)

		_				
Project Code	Project Name	_	Metro Budget	Actual	Variance Favorable  Jnfavorable)	2015 Actual
	IntelligentTransit System Study -					
270-10	91/605 Corridor Phase II	\$	30,000 \$	24,623	\$ 5,377 \$	22,010
270-12	Corridor Study (Phase V)		40,000	32,839	7,161	36,256
	Railroad Crossing Pavement Lights					
370-01	(9533)		143,000	104,089	38,911	-
440-25	Gardendale Street Im provements 9433		18,750	-	18,750	-
440-26	Orange Parkwa Improvements 9532		150,000	156,156	(6,156)	-
440-27	Arterial Street Resurfacing 9530		1,020,000	56,032	963,968	525,082
440-28	Arterial Street Resurfacing - 2016		415,000	449,297	(34,297)	-
440-29	Century Boulevard Medians 9633		265,000	290,993	(25,993)	-
440-30	LA River Bridge Repairs (9233)		120,000	115,000	5,000	-
450-02 480-06	Paramount Urban Renovation (9535) Pro C Administration		440,000 115,000	- 86,590	440,000 28,410	103,502
	Total expenditures	\$_	2,756,750 \$	1,315,619	\$ 1,441,131 \$	686,850

#### PROPOSITION C LOCAL RETURN FUND

# SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION SCHEDULE OF CAPITAL ASSETS

June 30, 2016

Date					Balance						Balance
Acquired		Description			7/1/2015		Additions		Deletions		6/30/2016
	None			Φ.		Φ		Φ		Φ	
	None			<b>a</b> _	-			Э		Ъ	
			Total	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-

#### MEASURE R LOCAL RETURN FUND

#### BALANCE SHEETS JUNE 30

		2016	_	2015
ASSETS				
Cash and investments	\$	267,570	\$	329,686
Interest receivable		272	_	176
Total assets	\$ _	267,842	\$ _	329,862
LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCE				
Liabilities				
Accounts payable	_	3,127	_	153,842
Total liabilities	\$	3,127	\$_	153,842
Fund Balance				
Restricted		264,715	_	176,020
Total fund balance		264,715	_	176,020
Total liabilities and fund balance	\$	267,842	\$	329,862

#### MEASURE R LOCAL RETURN FUND

# STATEMENTS OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES, AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCE

#### For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30

		2016	2015
REVENUES	•		
Measure R	\$	618,550	\$ 601,116
Interest income		1,062	583
Total revenues	,	619,612	601,699
EXPENDITURES			
Various projects		530,917	714,384
Total expenditures		530,917	714,384
Excess (deficiency) of revenues over expenditures		88,695	(112,685)
Fund balance at beginning of year		176,020	288,705
Fund balance at end of year	\$	264,715	\$ 176,020

#### MEASURE R LOCAL RETURN FUND

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES ACTUAL AND METRO APPROVED PROJECT BUDGET

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2016 (With Comparative Actual Amount for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2015)

Project Code	Project Name		Metro Budget	Actual	Variance Favorable (Unfavorable)	2015 Actual
1.05	Resurfacing improvements on various neighborhood streets (9631)	\$	505,000 \$	426,044	\$ 78,956 \$	153,843
1.05	Century Boulevard Medians (9633)		73,200	37,777	35,423	493,543
8.10	Administration	_	75,000	67,096	7,904	66,998
	Total expenditures	\$_	653,200 \$	530,917	\$ 122,283 \$	714,384

#### MEASURE R LOCAL RETURN FUND

# SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION SCHEDULE OF CAPITAL ASSETS

June 30, 2016

Date				Balance				Balance
Acquired		Description		7/1/2015	Additions	_	Deletions	6/30/2016
	None			\$ -	\$ -	\$		\$ -
			Total	\$ -	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -

### TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT ARTICLE 3 FUND (PURSUANT TO PUBLIC UTILITIES CODE SECTION 99234)

#### BALANCE SHEETS JUNE 30

		2016		2015
ASSETS				_
Cash and investment	\$	-	\$	-
Due from metro		2,923		-
Interest receivable		11		
Total assets	\$	2,934	\$ _	_
LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCE				
Liabilities				
Due to other funds	<u> </u>	2,934	_	
Total liabilities	\$	2,934	\$	
Fund Balance				
Reserved		-		
Total fund balance		-		
Total liabilities and fund balance	\$	2,934	\$	-

#### TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT ARTICLE 3 FUND

# STATEMENTS OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES, AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCE

#### For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30

	2016		2015
REVENUES			
TDA 3 revenue	\$ 35,084	\$	36,055
Interest income	27		-
Total revenues	35,111	·	36,055
EXPENDITURES			
Sidewalk construction	35,111	,	36,055
Total expenditures	35,111	•	36,055
Excess of revenues over expenditures	-		-
Fund balance at beginning of year		•	
Fund balance at end of year	\$ -	\$	-

# TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT ARTICLE 3 FUND SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

# SCHEDULE OF TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT ALLOCATION FOR SPECIFIC PROJECTS

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2016

	Program					Unexpended	Project
Project Description	Year		Allocations	 Expenditures		Allocations	Status
<b>Local allocations</b>							
Annuak sidewalk program	2015-16	\$	35,084	\$ 35,084	\$	-	Complete
TDA inteterest income	2015-16	_	27	 27			
Т	'otal	\$_	35,111	\$ 35,111	=	-	
Fund balance at beginning of	year				_	-	
Fund balance at end of year					\$		

#### NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2016 and 2015

#### NOTE 1 – SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

#### Fund Accounting

The operations of the Proposition A Local Return Fund (PALRF), Proposition C Local Return Fund (PCLRF), Measure R Local Return Fund (MRLRF) and Transportation Development Act Article 3 Fund (TDAA3F) (collectively, the Funds) are accounted for in separate sets of self-balancing accounts that comprise their assets, liabilities, fund balance, revenues and expenditures.

PALRF and PCLRF represent 25% and 20%, respectively, of the ½ cent Proposition A and ½ cent Proposition C sales taxes which are distributed to the jurisdictions within Los Angeles County based on population and must be used exclusively for transportation related programs and projects.

MRLRF is derived from 15% of a county-wide ½ cent sales tax which is distributed to the jurisdictions within Los Angeles County based on a per capita basis and must be used exclusively for transportation purposes.

Transportation Development Act Article 3 Fund (TDAA3F) is a Special Revenue Fund that accounts for the City's share of the Transportation Development Act Article 3 allocations which are legally restricted for specific purposes.

#### Basis of Accounting and Measurement focus

PALRF, PCLRF, MRLRF, and TDAA3F are accounted for using the modified accrual basis of accounting whereby revenues are recognized when they become both measurable and available to finance expenditures of the current period and expenditures are generally recognized when the related fund liabilities are incurred.

Special Revenue funds are reported on spending or "financial flow" measurement focus. This means that generally only current assets, current liabilities and deferred inflows and outflows of resources are included on their balance sheets. Statement of revenue, expenditures and changes in fund balance for Special Revenue Funds generally present increase (revenue and other financing sources) and decreases (expenditures and other financing uses) in net current assets.

#### Budgets and Budgetary Accounting

The budgeted amounts presented in this report for comparison to the actual amounts are presented in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

#### NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2016 and 2015 (Continued)

#### NOTE 1 – SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES (continued)

#### Fair Value Measurement

In accordance with GASB Statement No. 72, Fair Value measurement and Application, which became effective for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016, the city categorizes its fair value measurement within the fair value hierarchy that is based on the valuation inputs used to measure the fair value of the investment. Level 1 inputs are quoted prices in active markets for identical investments; Level 2 inputs are significant other observable inputs; Level 3 inputs are significant unobservable inputs. Accordingly, the city reports its investment at fair value and recognizes unrealized gain (loss) on investments.

Refer to city's 2016 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for detailed disclosures regarding the city's investments policy and fair value measurement.

#### Fund Balance Reporting

Governmental Accounting Standard Board (GASB) Statement No.54, Fund Balance Reporting and Governmental Fund Type Definitions, establishes the fund balance classifications that comprise a hierarchy based primarily on extent to which a government is bound to observe constraints imposed upon the use of resources reported in governmental funds.

The PALRF, PCLRF, MRLRF, and TDAA3F report the following fund balance classification as of June 30, 2016:

Restricted
 — Amounts that are constrained for specific purpose, which are externally imposed by providers, such as creditors, or amounts constrained due to constitutional provisions or enabling legislation. The use of the funds' remaining fund balance are restricted for projects approved by LACMTA

Information regarding the fund balance reporting policy adopted by the city is described in note 1 to the city's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report.

#### NOTE 2 – ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

The financial statements reflect only the financial position and results of operations of the PALRF, PCLRF, MRLRF, and TDAA3F and their compliance with the Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Program Guidelines, Measure R Local Return Program Guidelines, and Transportation Development Act Article 3 and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Funding and Allocation Guidelines for Transportation Development Act Article 3 Bicycle and Pedestrian Funds.

#### NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2016 and 2015 (Continued)

# NOTE 3 – PROPOSITION A AND PROPOSITION C LOCAL RETURN COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS

In accordance with Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Program Guidelines, funds received pursuant to these guidelines may only be used for Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return approved programs.

#### NOTE 4 – MEASURE R LOCAL RETURN COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS

In accordance with *Measure R Local Return Program Guidelines*, funds received pursuant to these guidelines may only be used for Measure R Local Return approved programs. See accompanying Compliance Matrix.

#### NOTE 5 – TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS

In accordance with Public Utilities Code Section 99234, funds received pursuant to this Code's section may only be used for activities relating to pedestrians and bicycle facilities.

#### **NOTE 6 – CASH AND INVESTMENTS**

The PALRF, PCLRF, MRLRF and TDAA3F cash and investment balances were pooled with various other City funds for deposit and investment purposes. The share of each fund in the pooled cash account was separately maintained and interest income was apportioned to the participating funds based on the relationship of their average quarterly balances to the total of the pooled cash and investments.

#### NOTE 7 – PROJECT GENERATED REVENUE

Project generated revenue under PALRF for the years ended June 30, 2016 and 2015 consisted of the following:

	2016	2015
Shuttle Fares	\$ 88,458	\$ 98,573
Taxi vouchers	3,476	4,915
College Transit	3,990	4,090
Total payment requested	\$ 95,924	\$ 107,578

#### NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2016 and 2015 (Continued)

#### NOTE 8 – TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT FUND REVENUE ALLOCATION

The revenue allocation for the years ended June 30, 2016 and 2015 consisted of the following:

	2016	2015
FY 2012-13 reserve	\$ 	\$ -
FY 2013-14 reserve	-	-
FY 2014-15 allocation	-	36,055
FY 2015-16 allocation	35,084	-
Total payment requested	\$ 35,084	\$ 36,055

#### NOTE 9 – TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT FUNDS RESERVED

In accordance with TDA Article 3 (SB821) Guidelines, funds not spent during the fiscal year have been placed on reserve in the Local Transportation Fund (LTF) account with the County Auditor-Controller to be drawn down whenever the funds become eligible for a specific project and an approved drawdown request is received by Metro. As of June 30, 2016 and 2015, the City has funds on reserve as follows:

	2016	2015
FY 2014-15 allocation	\$ -	\$ -
FY 2015-16 allocation	-	-
Available reserve balance	\$ -	\$ -

#### **NOTE 10 – SUBSEQUENT EVENTS**

The City has evaluated events or transactions that occurred subsequent to June 30, 2016 through December 5, 2016, the date the accompanying financial statements were available to be issued, for potential recognition or disclosure in the financial statements and determined no subsequent matters require disclosure or adjustment to the accompanying financial statements.



MELBA W. SIMPSON, CPA

# 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

To the Honorable Members of the City Council of the City of Paramount, California and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transit Authority

We have audited, 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, the financial statements of the Proposition A Local Return Fund (PALRF), Proposition C Local Return Fund (PCLRF), Measure R Local Return Fund (MRLRF), and Transportation Development Act Article 3 (TDAA3F) Fund of the City of Paramount, California (City), as of and for the year ended June 30, 2016, and the related notes to the financial statements, and have issued our report thereon dated December 5, 2016.

#### **Internal Control over Financial Reporting**

In planning and performing our audit of the financial statements, we considered the City's internal control over financial reporting (internal control) to determine the audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances for the purpose of expressing our opinions on the financial statements, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the City's internal control. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the City'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 City's local return funds and TDAA3F financial statements 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.





#### **Compliance and Other Matters**

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the City's financial statements are 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 determination of financial statement amounts. 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 result of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on the effectiveness of the entity's internal control or o 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.

Los Angeles, California

Simpson & Simpson

December 5, 2016





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

#### **Independent Auditor's Report on Compliance**

To the Honorable Members of the City Council of the City of Paramount, California and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transit Authority

#### **Report on Compliance**

We have audited the compliance of the City of Paramount, California (City) with the Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Guidelines, Measure R Local Return Guidelines, Transportation Development Act Article 3, and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's Funding and Allocation Guidelines for the Transportation Development Act Article 3 Bicycle and Pedestrian Funds (collectively, the Guidelines) for the year ended June 30, 2016.

#### Management's Responsibility

Management is responsible for the City's compliance with those guidelines.

#### Auditor's Responsibility

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

We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion on compliance. Our audit does not provide a legal determination of City's compliance with those requirements.

#### Opinion on Each Local Return Program and Transportation Development Act Article 3

In our opinion, the City of Paramount complied, in all material respects, with the compliance requirements referred to above that apply to Proposition A Local Return Fund, Proposition C Local Return Fund, Measure R Local Return Fund, and Transportation Development Act Article 3 (TDAA3F) Fund for the year ended June 30, 2016.





#### **Report on Internal Control over Compliance**

Management of the City of Paramount is responsible for establishing and maintaining effective internal control over compliance with the Requirements referred to above. In planning and performing our audit of compliance, we considered the City's internal control over compliance with the Requirements that could have a direct and material effect on the Local Return programs and the TDAA3F to determine the auditing procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances for the purpose of expressing an opinion on compliance and to test and report on internal control over compliance in accordance with the Requirements, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the City's 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 under the Requirements 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 under the Requirements 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 Requirements that is less severe than a material weakness in internal control over compliance, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance.

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

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.

Los Angeles, California

Simpson & Simpson

December 5, 2016

#### COMPLIANCE MATRIX

Year Ended June 30, 2016

	Compliance Requirement		n liance	Questioned	If no, provide details and						
	• •		No	Costs	management response.						
<b>A. P</b> 1	A. Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds										
1.	Timely use of funds.	X		None							
2.	Expenditures were approved before being incurred.	X		None							
3.	Funds were used on approved projects only and expenditures were supported and allowable per Guidelines.	X		None							
4.	Expenditures did not exceed 25% of Metro's approved budget.	X		None							
5.	Administrative expenses were within the 20% cap.	X		None							
6.	All on-going and carryover projects were reported in Form B.	X		None							
7.	Annual Project Summary Report (Form B) was submitted on time.	X		None							
8.	Annual Expenditure Report (Form C) was submitted on time.	X		None							
9.	Cash or cash equivalents were maintained.	X		None							
10.	Accounting procedures, record keeping and documentation were adequate.	X		None							
11.	Revenues received including allocations, project generated revenues and interest income was properly credited to the Measure R Local Return	X		None							

COMPLIANCE MATRIX Year Ended June 30, 2016

(Continued)

	$ \begin{array}{c c} & & & & & & \\ \textbf{Compliance Requirement} & & & & & \\ \textbf{Compliance Yes} & & \textbf{No.} \end{array} $			Questioned	If no, provide details and
			No	Costs	management response.
В. М	leasure R Local Return Fund				
1.	Timely use of funds.	X		None	
2.	Expenditures were approved before being incurred.	X		None	
3.	Funds were used on approved projects only and expenditures were supported and allowable per Guidelines.	X		None	
4.	Fund were not substituted for property tax	X		None	
5.	Administrative expenses are within the 20% cap.	X		None	
6.	Form One (Expenditure Plan) was submitted on time.	X		None	
7.	Expenditure Report (Form Two) was submitted on time.	X		None	
8.	Cash or cash equivalents were maintained.	X		None	
9.	Accounting procedures, record keeping and documentation were adequate.	X		None	
10.	Revenues received including allocations, project generated revenues and interest income was properly credited to the Measure R Local Return Account.	X		None	
11.	Funds were not used to supplant existing local revenue being used for transportation purpose	X		None	

COMPLIANCE MATRIX Year Ended June 30, 2016 (Continued)

Compliance Requirement		In Compliance		Questioned Costs	If no, provide details and management response.			
		Yes	No	Costs	management response.			
C. Transportation Development Act Article 3 Fund								
1.	Timely use of funds.	X		None				
2.	Expenditures were incurred for activities relating to pedestrian and bicycle facilities and amenities.	X		None				

# SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS June 30, 2016

No findings were noted.



# PROPOSITION A, PROPOSITION C, MEASURE R LOCAL RETURN FUNDS, AND TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT ARTICLE 3 FUND EXIT CONFERENCE June 30, 2016

An exit conference was held on December 5, 2016 via telephone conference. Those in attendance were:

#### Simpson & Simpson Representative:

Terry Bian, Auditor

#### City's Representative:

Clyde Alexander – Senior Accountant Karina Lam Liu – Finance Director

#### Matters Discussed:

Results of the audit disclosed no significant financial and compliance issues.

A copy of this report was forwarded to the following City representative for their comments prior to the issuance of the final report:

Clyde Alexander – Senior Accountant Karina Lam Liu – Finance Director