

City of Lawndale Annual Financial Report of its

Proposition A Local Return Fund Proposition C Local Return Fund Measure R Local Return Fund Transportation Development Act Article 3 Fund

As of and for the Year Ended June 30, 2016 with Report of Independent Auditors





## <u>PAGE</u>

FINANCIAL SECTION	
Report of Independent Auditors	1
Proposition A Local Return Fund: Basic Financial Statements: Balance Sheets Statements of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance Supplementary Information: Schedule of Expenditures – Actual and LACMTA Approved Project Budget Schedule of Capital Assets	4 5 6 7
Proposition C Local Return Fund: Basic Financial Statements: Balance Sheets Statements of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance Supplementary Information: Schedule of Expenditures – Actual and LACMTA Approved Project Budget Schedule of Capital Assets	8 9 10 11
Measure R Local Return Fund: Basic Financial Statements: Balance Sheets Statements of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance Supplementary Information: Schedule of Expenditures – Actual and LACMTA Approved Project Budget Schedule of Capital Assets	12 13 14 15
Transportation Development Act Article 3 Fund: Basic Financial Statements: Balance Sheets Statements of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance Supplementary Information: Schedule of Transportation Development Act Allocation for Specific Projects	16 17 18
Notes to Funds Financial Statements	19
Report of Independent Auditors 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>	24
COMPLIANCE SECTION	
Report of Independent Auditors on Compliance Compliance Matrix	26 28
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS	30
EXIT CONFERENCE	31

**FINANCIAL SECTION** 



801 South Grand Ave., Suite 400 Los Angeles, CA 90017 Ph. (213) 873-1700 Fax (213) 873-1777

www.vasquezcpa.com

OFFICE LOCATIONS: Los Angeles Sacramento San Diego

## **Report of Independent Auditors**

To the Honorable Members of the City Council of the City of Lawndale, 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, Proposition C Local Return Fund, Measure R Local Return Fund and the Transportation Development Act Article 3 Fund (collectively, the Funds), of the City of Lawndale, California (the City) which comprise the Funds' balance sheets as of June 30, 2016, and the related statements of revenues, expenditures and changes in fund balances for the year then ended, and the related notes to the financial statements.

## 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.

#### Auditors' Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express opinions on these financial statements based on our audits. We conducted our audits 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 audits to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free from material misstatement.

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the 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 Proposition A Local Return Fund, the Proposition C Local Return Fund, the Measure R Local Return Fund and the Transportation Development Act Article 3 Fund of the City of Lawndale, California, as of June 30, 2016, and the respective changes in 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 Proposition A Local Return Fund, the Proposition C Local Return Fund, the Measure R Local Return Fund and the Transportation Development Act Article 3 Fund, as of and for the year ended June 30, 2015, were audited by other auditors, whose report, dated December 14, 2015, expressed an unmodified opinion on those statements.

## Emphasis of Matter

As discussed in Note 2, the financial statements present only the Proposition A Local Return Fund, the Proposition C Local Return Fund, the Measure R Local Return Fund and the Transportation Development Act Article 3 Fund of the City and do not purport to, and do not present fairly the financial position of the City as of June 30, 2016, and the changes in its financial position for the year then ended in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. Our opinion is not modified with respect to this matter.

## Supplementary Information

Our audits were conducted for the purpose of forming opinions on each of the Funds' financial statements as a whole. The supplementary information identified in the table of contents is presented for purposes of additional analysis and is not a required part of the basic financial statements.

The supplementary information identified in the table of contents is the responsibility of management and was derived from and relates directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the Funds' basic financial statements. Such information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the Funds' basic financial statements and certain additional procedures, including comparing and reconciling such information directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the Funds' basic financial statements or to the Funds' basic financial statements themselves, and other additional procedures in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. In our opinion, the supplementary information is fairly stated, in all material respects, in relation to each of the Funds' basic financial statements as a whole.



## Other Reporting Required by Government Auditing Standards

In accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*, we have also issued our report dated December 14, 2016 on our consideration of the City's internal control over the Funds' 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 the Funds' financial reporting and compliance and the results of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on internal control over the Funds' 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 the Funds' financial reporting and compliance.

Vargues & Company LLP

Los Angeles, California December 14, 2016

	Ju	ne 30
	2016	2015
ASSETS		
Cash and investments \$	1,083,345	\$ 975,292
Accounts receivable	31,107	-
Interest receivable	3,111	2,180
Total assets \$	1,117,563	\$ 977,472
LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCE		
Liabilities		
Accounts payable \$	96,134	\$ 63,641
Accrued payroll and employee benefits	1,223	4,575
Total liabilities	97,357	68,216
Fund balance		
Restricted	1,020,206	909,256
Total fund balance	1,020,206	909,256
Total liabilities and fund balance \$	1,117,563	\$ 977,472

	Years ended June 30		
	2016	2015	
Revenues			
Proposition A \$	599,774 \$	584,640	
Proposition A Discretionary Incentive Grant	35,039	34,356	
Interest income	7,125	6,562	
Open Bike Grant	37,875	-	
Bus fares	852	528	
Total revenues	680,665	626,086	
<b>Expenditures</b> Expeditures funded by PALRF Expenditures funded by Open Bike Grant	531,840 37,875	546,717	
Total expenditures	569,715	546,717	
Excess of revenues over expenditures	110,950	79,369	
Fund balance at beginning of year	909,256	829,887	
Fund balance at end of year \$	1,020,206 \$	909,256	

## City of Lawndale Proposition A Local Return Fund Supplementary Information Schedule of Expenditures – Actual and LACMTA Approved Project Budget Year ended June 30, 2016 (With Comparative Actuals for 2015)

					2016			_	
							Variance		
Project			LACMTA				Positive		2015
Code	Project Name		Budget		Actual		(Negative)		Actual
110-01	Shuttle Bus	\$	430,000	\$	375,540	\$	54,460	\$	380,469
130-01	Special Service Paratransit		121,350		104,671		16,679		94,099
480-03	Administration	_	93,742		51,629		42,113		72,149
	Total expenditures	\$_	645,092	\$_	531,840	\$_	113,252	_\$_	546,717

See report of independent auditors.

Date Acquired	Description		Balance July 1, 2015	 Additions	Deletions	Balance June 30, 2016
2001	El Dorado Aerotech	\$	58,286	\$ - \$	- \$	58,286
2003	Senior Van		45,836	 -	-	45,836
		Total \$	104,122	\$ \$	\$	104,122

See report of independent auditors.

	June 30			
	2016	2015		
ASSETS				
Cash and investments \$	2,459,990	\$ 2,102,589		
Interest receivable	6,942	4,720		
Total assets \$	2,466,932	\$ 2,107,309		
LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCE Liabilities Accounts payable Accrued payroll and employee benefits Total liabilities	378,215 2,761 380,976	\$ <u>3,919</u>		
<b>Fund balance</b> Restricted - Inglewood Avenue Corridor Widening Project Restricted - Prairie Avenue North Improvement Project	686,040 511,746	681,671 508,487		
Restricted - Others	888,170	913,232		
Total fund balance	2,085,956	2,103,390		
Total liabilities and fund balance \$	2,466,932	\$2,107,309		

	_	Years ended June 30			
		2016	2015		
Revenues					
Proposition C	\$	<b>497,155</b> \$	484,826		
Interest income	_	15,768	16,256		
	Total revenues	512,923	501,082		
<b>Expenditures</b> Various projects	Total expenditures	<u> </u>	<u>918,652</u> 918,652		
Deficiency of revenues over exper	nditures	(17,434)	(417,570)		
Fund balance at beginning of year	_	2,103,390	2,520,960		
Fund balance at end of year	\$ _	2,085,956 \$	2,103,390		

See notes to Funds financial statements.

## City of Lawndale Proposition C Local Return Fund Supplementary Information Schedule of Expenditures – Actual and LACMTA Approved Project Budget Year ended June 30, 2016 (With Comparative Actuals for 2015)

	_				
Project Code	Project Name	LACMTA Budget	Actual	Variance Positive (Negative)	2015 Actual
380-01	Inglewood Avenue Corridor Widening Project \$	650,000 \$	- \$	650,000 \$	-
380-02	Prairie Avenue North Improvement Project	500,000	-	500,000	-
440-01	Inglewood/Marine Intersection	100,500	-	100,500	-
440-02	Inglewood/MMB Widening	325,000	-	325,000	-
440-03	149th (Hawthorne to Larch)	215,000	-	215,000	-
440-15	Burin Ave	-	-	-	121,224
440-16	Firmona Ave/MB to RB Blvd	-	-	-	500,000
440-17	158th Rixford/153rd St Improvement	-	-	-	135,000
440-20	Various Bus Stop Concrete Work	449,000	416,543	32,457	-
440-21	Inglewood/Marine Intersection	-	-	-	342
480-03	Administration	271,869	87,890	183,979	131,904
500-01	Engineering Services	198,043	25,924	172,119	30,182
	Total expenditures \$ _	2,709,412 \$	530,357 \$	2,179,055 \$	918,652

Date _Acquired_	De	scription	Balance July 1, 2015		Additions		Deletions		Balance June 30, 2016	
	None	Total S	\$ \$	\$_ \$_	-	\$ \$		\$_ \$_		- -

See report of independent auditors.

		Jur	ne 30	)
		2016		2015
ASSETS				
Cash and investments	\$	204,979	\$	173,744
Interest receivable		505		397
	Total assets \$	205,484	\$	174,141
LIABILITIES AND FUND	BALANCE			
Liabilities				
Accrued payroll and employee ben	efits \$	505	\$	3,586
	Total liabilities	505		3,586
				· · · · · ·
Fund balance				
Restricted		204,979		170,555
	Total fund balance	204,979		170,555
Total liabilitie	es and fund balance \$	205,484	\$	174,141
	· —	<u> </u>	_	<u> </u>

		Years ended June 30		
		2016	2015	
Revenues				
Measure R	\$	373,348 \$	363,790	
South Bay Council of Governments		-	47,360	
Interest income		1,131	4,092	
	Total revenues	374,479	415,242	
<b>Expenditures</b> Various projects	<b>-</b>	340,055	935,525	
	Total expenditures	340,055	935,525	
Excess (deficiency) of revenues over e	expenditures	34,424	(520,283)	
Fund balance at beginning of year		170,555	690,838	
Fund balance at end of year	\$	204,979 \$	170,555	

			2016			
Project Code	LACMTA Project Name Budget		Actual	Variance Positive (Negative)	2015 Actual	
1.05	Freeman/166th/RB Blvd \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	192,824	
1.05	169th Street	-	-	-	357,874	
1.05	Condon Ave/Rosecrans/147th St	-	-	-	84,509	
1.05	171st St/Hawthorne/Freeman	-	-	-	128,557	
1.05	Grevilla Ave/145th to Marine	238,200	205,240	32,960	-	
1.05	Avis Ave/147th to Marine	123,000	77,606	45,394	-	
7.90	Other Planning, Engineering, or CMP	-	-	-	51,608	
7.90	Grevilla Ave/145th to Marine	2,846	533	2,313	-	
7.90	Avis Ave/147th to Marine	1,466	-	1,466	-	
8.10	Fund Administration	73,101	56,676	16,425	120,153	
	Total expenditures \$	438,613 \$	340,055 \$	98,558 \$	935,525	

Date Acquired	Description		Balance July 1, 2015		Additions		Deletions	Balance June 30, 2016
2011	2011 El Dorado Aerotech 240 Total	\$_ \$_	66,278 66,278	\$ \$	-	\$ \$	<u>-</u> \$ \$	66,278 66,278

See report of independent auditors.

		June 30		
	-	2016	2015	
	ASSETS			
Due from LACMTA	\$	37,504	\$-	
Interest receivable		7		
	Total assets \$	37,511	_\$	
Liabilities	S AND FUND BALANCE	704	¢	
Accounts payable	\$	794	φ -	
Due to other funds	Total liabilities	35,923 36,717		
Fund balance				
Restricted		794	-	
	Total fund balance	794	-	
	Total liabilities and fund balance \$	37,511	\$	

	_	Years ended	June 30
	-	2016	2015
Revenues			
Intergovernmental Allocations:			
Article 3	\$	37,504 \$	20,890
Interest income	-	7	-
	Total revenues	37,511	20,890
Expenditures Sidewalk Reconstruction	Total expenditures	<u>36,717</u> <u>36,717</u>	20,890 20,890
Excess of revenues over expenditure	es	794	-
Fund balance at beginning of year	-	<u> </u>	
Fund balance at end of year	\$_	<u>794</u> \$	

## City of Lawndale Transportation Development Act Article 3 Fund Pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 99234 Supplementary Information Schedule of Transportation Development Act Allocation for Specific Projects Year ended June 30, 2016

				Т	otals to Date		
Project Description	Program Year	) 	Allocations	E	Expenditures	Unexpended Allocations	Project Status
Local Allocations:							
Sidewalk Reconstruction Totals	2016	\$ \$	37,504 37,504	·	<u>36,717</u> \$ <u>36,717</u>	787	Completed
Unexpended interest income						7	
Fund balance at beginning of ye	ar						
Fund balance at end of year					\$	794	*

\* As of June 30, 2016, the City has not received the revenue draw down of \$37,504 for the FY 2015/16. The unspent fund balance of \$794 was returned to LACMTA in FY 2016/17.

## 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.

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

The PALRF, PCLRF, MRLRF, and TDAA3F are reported as Special Revenue Funds of the City and are accounted for using the modified accrual basis of accounting. Revenues are recognized when they become "susceptible to accrual", that is, measurable and available to finance expenditures of the current period. Expenditures are recorded when the liability is incurred.

Special Revenue Funds are reported on a 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. Statements of revenues, expenditures and changes in fund balances for Special Revenue Funds generally present increases (revenues 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.

## 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 investments at fair value and recognizes unrealized gain (loss) on investments.

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

## Fund Balance Reporting

Governmental Accounting Standards 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 the extent to which a government is bound to observe constraints imposed upon the use of the 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 purposes, 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 balances 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 do not purport to, and do not present fairly the City's financial position as of June 30, 2016, and the changes in its financial position for the year then ended in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

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

The Proposition A Ordinance requires that Local Return (LR) funds be used exclusively to benefit public transit. Expenditures related to fixed route and paratransit services, Transportation Demand Management, Transportation Systems Management and fare subsidy programs that exclusively benefit transit are all eligible uses of Proposition A LR funds. Proposition A LR funds may also be traded with other Jurisdictions in exchange for general or other funds.

The Proposition C Ordinance directs that LR funds also be used to benefit public transit, as described above, but provides an expanded list of eligible project expenditures including Congestion Management Programs, bikeways and bike lanes, street improvements supporting public transit service, and Pavement Management System projects. Proposition C LR funds cannot be traded.

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. See accompanying Compliance Matrix.

## NOTE 4 MEASURE R LOCAL RETURN COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS

The Measure R Ordinance specifies that LR funds be used exclusively for transportation purposes.

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. See accompanying Compliance Matrix.

#### NOTE 6 CASH AND INVESTMENTS

The PALRF, PCLRF, MRLRF and TDAA3F cash 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.

Please refer to the City's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) for a full description of risks relating to cash and investments.

## NOTE 7 PROPOSITION A DISCRETIONARY INCENTIVE GRANT

Proposition A Discretionary Incentive Grant amounting to \$35,039 and \$34,356 for the years ended June 30, 2016 and 2015, respectively, represent additional funds received from LACMTA for participating in the Voluntary National Transit Database (NTD) Reporting Program.

The Proposition A Discretionary Incentive Grant were recorded under PALRF.

## NOTE 8 PROPOSITION C CAPITAL RESERVE

On July 1, 2008 and June 30, 2011, LACMTA and the City entered into capital reserve agreements, CRA.PCLRLND08 and CRA.PCLRLND2 to establish a capital reserve account (Account) for the Inglewood Avenue Corridor Widening Project (IACW) and Prairie Avenue North Improvement Project (PANI), respectively. On June 30, 2014, LACMTA and the City amended both agreements to extend the termination dates to June 30, 2017. If the project is not completed by June 30, 2017, any unexpended funds shall lapse and be returned to LACMTA.

Per the agreements, all interest is accrued and placed in the capital reserve accounts for use exclusively for the Inglewood Avenue Corridor Widening Project and the Prairie Avenue North Improvement Project.

For the years ended June 30, 2016 and 2015, following is the capital reserve amount:

		IACW	PANI
Capital reserve, June 30, 2014	\$	676,481	\$ 504,616
Interest income earned		5,190	3,871
Capital Reserve, June 30, 2015	-	681,671	508,487
Interest income earned		4,369	3,259
Capital reserve, June 30, 2016	\$	686,040	\$ 511,746

#### NOTE 9 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT ARTICLE 3 FUND REVENUE ALLOCATION

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

	2016	2015
FY 2012/13 allocation	\$ -	\$ 14,195
FY 2013/14 allocation	20,101	6,695
FY 2014/15 allocation	17,403	-
	\$ 37,504	\$ 20,890

## NOTE 10 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT ARTICLE 3 FUNDS RESERVED

In accordance with TDA Article 3 (SB821) Guidelines, funds which will not be 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 LACMTA. As of June 30, 2016 and 2015, the City has funds on reserve as follows:

	2016	2015
FY 2013/14 reserve	\$ -	\$ 20,101
FY 2014/15 reserve	4,424	21,827
FY 2015/16 allocation	21,183	-
	\$ 25,607	\$ 41,928

For FY 2015/16, any TDA Article 3 funds left on reserve for FY 2011/12 or prior, are subject to lapse if not claimed by the City by June 30, 2016. There were no funds that lapsed in FY 2015/16.

## NOTE 11 SUBSEQUENT EVENTS

The City has evaluated subsequent events through December 14, 2016, the date the financial statements were available to be issued, and concluded no events have occurred that require disclosure or adjustments to the financial statements.



801 South Grand Ave., Suite 400 Los Angeles, CA 90017 Ph. (213) 873-1700 Fax (213) 873-1777

www.vasquezcpa.com

OFFICE LOCATIONS: Los Angeles Sacramento San Diego

## Report of Independent Auditors 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 Lawndale, California and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

We have audited, in accordance with the auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, the financial statements of the Proposition A Local Return Fund, the Proposition C Local Return Fund, the Measure R Local Return Fund and the Transportation Development Act Article 3 Fund (collectively, the Funds) of the City of Lawndale, California (the 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 14, 2016.

## Internal Control over Financial Reporting

In planning and performing our audits of the Funds' financial statements, we considered the City's internal control over the Funds' financial reporting (internal control) to determine the audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances for the purpose of expressing our opinions on the Funds' 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 a combination of deficiencies, in internal control, such that there is a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement of the Funds' 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 audits 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 Proposition A Local Return Fund, Proposition C Local Return Fund, Measure R Local Return Fund, and Transportation Development Act Article 3 Fund financial statements are free from 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 audits, 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.

angues & Company LLP

Los Angeles, California December 14, 2016

**COMPLIANCE SECTION** 



801 South Grand Ave., Suite 400 Los Angeles, CA 90017 Ph. (213) 873-1700 Fax (213) 873-1777

www.vasquezcpa.com

OFFICE LOCATIONS: Los Angeles Sacramento San Diego

## **Report of Independent Auditors on Compliance**

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

## Report on Compliance

We have audited the compliance of the City of Lawndale, California (the 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 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 the Guidelines.

## Auditors' Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the City's compliance with the Guidelines based on our audit. We conducted our audit 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* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States; and the Guidelines. Those standards and the Guidelines require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether noncompliance with the compliance requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on the Proposition A Local Return Program, Proposition C Local Return Program, Measure R Local Return Program, and Transportation Development Act Article 3 Program occurred. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence about the 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 with the Guidelines. However, our audit does not provide a legal determination of the City's compliance with the Guidelines.

## Opinion

In our opinion, the City of Lawndale, California complied, in all material respects, with the compliance requirements of the Guidelines for the year ended June 30, 2016.



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

Management of the City is responsible for establishing and maintaining effective internal control over compliance with the compliance requirements referred to above. In planning and performing our audit of compliance, we considered the City's internal control over compliance to determine the auditing procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances for the purpose of expressing an opinion on compliance, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of internal control over compliance. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of 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 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 with the requirements, such that there is a reasonable possibility that material noncompliance 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 might 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 or significant deficiencies 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.

gnes & Company LLP

Los Angeles, California December 14, 2016

	Compliance Requirements		Complia	ance	Questioned	If no, provide details and management response.
Compliance Requirements	Yes	No	N/A	Costs		
Α.	Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds					
	1. Uses the State Controller's					
	Uniform System of Accounts					
	and Records.	Х				
	2. Timely use of funds.	Х				
	3. Funds expended were					
	approved and have not been					
	substituted for property tax.	Х				
	4. Expenditures that exceeded					
	25% of approved project budget					
	have approved amended					
	Project Description Form (Form	Ň				
	A)	Х				
	5. Administrative expenses are					
	within the 20% cap of the total annual Local Return					
	Expenditures.	х				
	6. All on-going and carryover	^				
	projects were reported in Form					
	B.	Х				
	7. Annual Project Summary	~				
	Report (Form B) was submitted					
	on time.	Х				
	8. Annual Expenditure Report					
	(Form C) was submitted on					
	time.	Х				
	9. Cash or cash equivalents are					
	maintained.	Х				
	10. Accounting procedures, record					
	keeping and documentation are					
	adequate.	Х				
	11. Pavement Management System					
	(PMS) in place and being used					
	for Street Maintenance or					
	Improvement Projects Expenditures.	х				
	12. Local Return Account is	~				
	credited for reimbursable					
	expenditures.			x		
	13. Self-Certification was completed					
	and submitted for Intelligent					
	Transportation Systems					
	projects or elements.			Х		
	14. Assurances and					
	Understandings form was on					
	file.	Х				
	15. Recreational Transit Form was					
	submitted on time.			Х		

		In	Complia	ance		If no, provide details
	Compliance Requirements	Yes	No N/A		Questioned Costs	and management response.
В.	Measure R Local Return Fund					•
	<ol> <li>Funds were expended for</li> </ol>					
	transportation purposes.	Х				
	<ol><li>Funds were used to augment,</li></ol>					
	not supplant, existing local					
	revenues being used for					
	transportation purposes unless					
	there is a funding shortfall.	Х				
	<ol><li>Signed Assurances and</li></ol>					
	Understandings on file.	Х				
	4. Separate Measure R Local					
	Return Account was					
	established.	Х				
	5. Revenues received including					
	allocations, project generated					
	revenues and interest income					
	was properly credited to the					
	Measure R Local Return	V				
	Account.	Х				
	6. Funds were expended with	V				
	LACMTA's approval.	Х				
	7. Expenditure Plan (Form One)	v				
	was submitted on time.	Х				
	8. Expenditure Report (Form Two) was submitted on time.	v				
		X X				
	<ol> <li>9. Timely use of funds.</li> <li>10. Administrative expenses are</li> </ol>	^				
	within the 20% cap.	х				
	11. Fund exchanges were approved	^				
	by LACMTA.			x		
	12. A separate account was					
	established for Capital reserve					
	funds and Capital reserve was					
	approved by LACMTA.			х		
	13. Recreational transit form was					
	submitted on time.			х		
C.	Transportation Development Act					
	Article 3 Fund					
	1. Timely use of funds.	Х				
	2. Expenditures were incurred for					
	activities relating to pedestrian					
	and bicycle facilities and					
	amenities.	Х				

SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS

There were no findings noted.

EXIT CONFERENCE

An exit conference was held on December 14, 2016 with the City of Lawndale representative. Those in attendance were:

Vasquez and Company LLP representatives: Cristy Canieda – Partner Marialyn Salvador – Audit Manager

City of Lawndale representative: Wayne Schaller – Accounting Manager

Matters discussed:

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

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

Wayne Schaller – Accounting Manager



#### www.vasquezcpa.com

Vasquez & Company LLP has over 45 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 for more information regarding RSM US LLP and RSM International. The RSM<sup>™</sup> logo is used under license by RSM US LLP. RSM US Alliance products and services are proprietary to RSM US LLP.

801 South Grand Avenue, Suite 400 • Los Angeles, California 90017-4646 • Ph. (213) 873-1700 • Fax (213) 873-1777