# CITY OF COMPTON ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE

PROPOSITION A LOCAL RETURN FUND PROPOSITION C LOCAL RETURN FUND

FOR THE FISCAL YEARS ENDED JUNE 30, 2015 AND 2014



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

FINANCIAL SECTION	PAGE
Independent Auditor's Report	1
Proposition A Local Return Fund: Basic Financial Statements:	
Balance Sheets	3
Statements of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance Supplemental Information:	4
Schedule of Expenditures – Actual and Metro Approved Project Budget	5
Schedule of Capital Assets	6
Proposition C Local Return Fund:	
Basic Financial Statements:	
Balance Sheets	8
Statements of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance	9
Supplemental Information:	10
Schedule of Expenditures – Actual and Metro Approved Project Budget	10
Schedule of Capital Assets	11
Notes to Financial Statements	12
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>	15
COMPLIANCE SECTION	
Independent Auditor's Report on Compliance	17
Compliance Matrix	19
Schedule of Findings and Recommendations	20
	•
EXIT CONFERENCE	21





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

MELBA W. SIMPSON, CPA

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

To the Honorable Members of the City Council of the City of Compton, 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) and Proposition C Local Return Fund (PCLRF) of the City of Compton, California (City) as of and for the years ended June 30, 2015 and 2014, 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 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 opinion.





In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the respective financial position of the PALRF and PCLRF of the City of Compton, California, as of June 30, 2015 and 2014, and the respective changes in financial position for the years then ended in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

#### **Emphasis of Matter**

As discussed in Note 2, the financial statements present only the PALRF and PCLRF and do not purport to, and do not present fairly, the financial position of the City of Compton, California, as of June 30, 2015 and 2014, 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.

#### Other Matters

#### Other Information

Our audit was conducted for the purpose of forming opinions on the financial statements that collectively comprise the City of Compton, California's PALRF and PCLRF Fund financial statements as a whole. The accompanying supplemental information as listed in the table of contents is presented for purposes of additional analysis and is not a required part of the financial statements. The supplemental 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 supplemental 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 information is fairly stated in all material respects, in relation to the financial statements as a whole.

#### Other Reporting Required by Governmental Auditing Standards

In accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*, we have issued our report dated February 24, 2016, on our consideration of the City of Compton'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* and should be considered in assessing the results of our audit.

Los Angeles, California

Simpson & Simpson

February 24, 2016

# PROPOSITION A LOCAL RETURN FUND

# BALANCE SHEETS JUNE 30

		2015	_	2014
ASSETS				_
Cash	\$	1,057,553	\$	832,013
Accounts receivable		2,393		2,392
Interest receivable		2,789	_	
Total assets	\$ _	1,062,735	\$ =	834,405
LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCE				
Liabilities				
Accounts payable	\$	166,294	\$	76,373
Accrued liabilities		-		62,124
Due to General Fund		-	· <u>-</u>	90,056
Total liabilities	_	166,294	· <u>-</u>	228,553
Fund Balance				
Restricted	_	896,441	_	605,852
Total fund balance	_	896,441	-	605,852
Total liabilities and fund balance	\$ _	1,062,735	\$ _	834,405

# PROPOSITION A LOCAL RETURN FUND

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

#### For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30

	2015	2014
REVENUES		_
Proposition A	\$ 1,725,182	\$ 1,655,581
Proposition A Discretionary Incentive grant (Note 5)	56,642	-
Interest income	5,545	1,607
Project generated revenue (Note 6)	78,997	90,208
Total revenues	1,866,366	1,747,396
EXPENDITURES		
Various projects	1,634,899	1,562,899
Total expenditures	1,634,899	1,562,899
Excess of revenues over expenditures	231,467	184,497
Fund balance at beginning of year, as previously reported	605,852	421,355
Prior period adjustment (Notes 5 and 7)	59,122	
Fund balance at the beginning of year, as restated	664,974	421,355
Fund balance at end of year	\$ 896,441	\$ 605,852

# PROPOSITION A LOCAL RETURN FUND

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

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2015 (With Comparative Actual Amount for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2014)

							Variance	
Project			Metro				Favorable	2014
Code	Project Name		Budget		Actual	(	Unfavorable)	Actual
110-07	Fixed Route Transit System	\$	1,000,000	\$	1,162,859	\$	(162,859) \$	920,247
130-04	Dial-A-Ride Transit System		348,540		311,578		36,962	254,717
180-40	Purchase Five Buses		-		-		-	310,735
240-17	Dial-A-Taxi		60,000		60,462		(462)	-
280-29	Marketing and Promotions of the		10,000		10,000		-	-
	Compton Renaissance Fixed Route							
	Transit							
500-07	Self Insured Compton Employer	_	90,000		90,000		<u> </u>	77,200
	Total expenditures	\$_	1,508,540	\$	1,634,899	\$	(126,359) \$	1,562,899

# PROPOSITION A LOCAL RETURN FUND

# SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION SCHEDULE OF CAPITAL ASSETS

June 30, 2015

Date		Balance			Balance
Acquired	Description	 7/1/2014	 Additions	 Deletions	 6/30/2015
1987-91	MLK Transit Center	\$ 2,069,970	\$ _	\$ _	\$ 2,069,970
1989	Ford Falcon	36,082	-	-	36,082
1987	Ford Econoline	40,949	-	-	40,949
1986	Ford Econoline	39,565	-	-	39,565
1984	Ford Escort Van	36,070	-	-	36,070
1984	Ford Escort Van	36,070	-	-	36,070
1984	Ford Escort Van	34,540	-	-	34,540
1991	Paratransit Bus	44,770	-	-	44,770
1992	Ford Challenger Van	43,371	-	-	43,371
1992	Gestetner Copies	3,404	-	-	3,404
1993	Ford Challenger Van	47,072	-	-	47,072
1993	Communication Equipment	833	-	-	833
1993	Furniture and Equipment	8,596	-	-	8,596
1994	Ford Challenger Van	49,445	-	-	49,445
1994	Communication Equipment	1,290	-	-	1,290
1995	Ford Champion Challenger Bus	46,803	-	-	46,803
2001	NEC Computer	3,127	-	-	3,127
2001	Motorola Radio	1,951	-	-	1,951
2002	Furniture and Equipment/MLK	1,131	-	-	1,131
2002	Communication - Curb Side Ramp	241,540	-	-	241,540
2002	Champion Paratransit Bus	99,544	-	-	99,544
2002	Motorola Wireless Base Control Antenna	3,414	-	-	3,414
	Kit, Two-Way Radios				
2002	Land/Land Improvement	1,219,525	-	-	1,219,525
2003	Natural Gas Transit Buses	149,000	-	-	149,000
2004	5 CNG Buses	347,112	-	-	347,112
2005	Quadrant Gate at 4 Blue Line Arterial	165,748	-	-	165,748
	Street				
2005	MLK Transit Center Renovation	986,798	-	-	986,798
2005	Machinery and Equipment	17,862	-	-	17,862
2005	7 Ford Vehicles	173,405	-	-	173,405
2007	MLK Transit Center Renovation	42,532	-	-	42,532
2007	Transit Vehicle	159,055	-	-	159,055
2008	Transit Vehicle	115,704	-	-	115,704

# PROPOSITION A LOCAL RETURN FUND

# SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION SCHEDULE OF CAPITAL ASSETS

(Continued) June 30, 2015

Date Acquired	Description		Balance 7/1/2014	 Additions	 Deletions	 Balance 6/30/2015
2010	Bus Stop Shelter Construction	\$	29,870	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 29,870
2010	Bus Stop Improvement Project		103,043	-	-	103,043
2014	5 Buses *	_	310,735	 -	 -	 310,735
		Total \$	6,709,926	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,709,926

\* The purchase of the 5 Buses in the amount of \$866,799 was funded by the following:

Proposition A Local Return funds	\$ 310,735
DOT Paratransit Vehicle Grant funds	 556,064
Total purchase price of the 5 Buses	\$ 866,799

# PROPOSITION C LOCAL RETURN FUND

# BALANCE SHEETS JUNE 30

	_	2015		2014		
ASSETS						
Cash	\$	4,125,880	\$	5,157,230		
Interest receivable		7,385	. ,			
Total assets	\$	4,133,265	\$	5,157,230		
LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCE						
Liabilities						
Accounts payble	\$	1,128,978	\$	182,890		
Accrued liabilities		-		43,273		
Due to General Fund		-		159,622		
Accrued wages and benefits		50		-		
Contract retention payable		112,497		69,250		
YMCA contributions payable		26	. ,	26		
Total liabilities		1,241,551	•	455,061		
Fund Balance						
Reserved (Note 8)		-		1,184,100		
Restricted		2,891,714	. ,	3,518,069		
Total fund balance		2,891,714		4,702,169		
Total liabilities and fund balance	\$	4,133,265	\$	5,157,230		

# PROPOSITION C LOCAL RETURN FUND

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

#### For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30

	2015		2014
REVENUES			
Proposition C	\$ 1,430,711 \$	\$	1,372,716
Interest income	19,430		9,994
Total revenues	1,450,141	_	1,382,710
EXPENDITURES			
Various projects	2,993,416	_	625,682
Total expenditures	2,993,416	_	625,682
(Deficiency) excess of revenues over expenditures	(1,543,275)	_	757,028
Fund balance at beginning of year, as previously reported	4,702,169		3,945,141
Prior period adjustment (Note 7)	(267,180)	_	
Fund balance at the beginning of year, as restated	4,434,989		3,945,141
Fund balance at end of year	\$ 2,891,714 \$	\$ <u>_</u>	4,702,169

#### PROPOSITION C LOCAL RETURN FUND

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

For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2015 (With Comparative Actual Amount for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2014)

	2015							
							Variance	
Project			Metro				Favorable	2014
Code	Project Name	_	Budget		Actual	(	(Unfavorable)	Actual
270-42	Central Avenue Street Corridor Transportation Study	\$	260,217	\$	170,840	\$	89,377 \$	-
400-01	Traffic Signals Upgrade and TMOC *		600,000		2,187,033		(1,587,033)	625,682
440-28	Street Improvement and Maintenance **		300,000		605,748		(305,748)	-
440-41	Transportation Enhancement		131,336		-		131,336	-
470-43	Pavement Management Study		104,948		-		104,948	-
480-10	Contractual Services Proposition C Support	_	50,000		29,795		20,205	-
	Total expenditures	\$_	1,446,501	\$	2,993,416	\$	(1,546,915) \$	625,682

<sup>\*</sup> The City submitted a revised Form A for Project Code 400-01, Traffic Signals Upgrade and TMOC Project and the budget was approved for \$2,454,212 by LACMTA on October 8, 2015.

<sup>\*\*</sup> The City submitted a revised Form A for Project Code 440-28, Street Improvement and Maintenance Project and the budget was approved for \$605,748 by LACMTA on October 8, 2015.

# PROPOSITION C LOCAL RETURN FUND

# SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION SCHEDULE OF CAPITAL ASSETS

June 30, 2015

Date Acquired	Description		Balance 7/1/2014	 Additions	 Deletions	 Balance 6/30/2015
1995	Computer Hardware/Software	\$	14,893	\$ _	\$ _	\$ 14,893
1998	Buses/Van		491,277	-	-	491,277
1998	Machinery and Equipment		2,565	-	-	2,565
1998	Machinery and Equipment		5,053	-	-	5,053
1998	Fire Resistance		9,872	-	-	9,872
1998	Reconstruction of the Bus Turnouts and		50,600	-	-	50,600
	Driveways at MLK Transit Center					
1998	Rosecrans Avenue Rehabilitation Project		576,218	-	-	576,218
1998	Computer Hardware/Software		8,013	-	-	8,013
1998	Machinery and Equipment		4,998	-	-	4,998
1998	Rosecrans Avenue Rehabilitation Project		1,010,607	-	-	1,010,607
2001	Bus Shelter Benches		65,941	-	-	65,941
2001	Computer Hardware/Software		12,606	-	-	12,606
2001	Rehabilitation Project		177,117	-	-	177,117
2001	Rosecrans Avenue Rehabilitation Project		8,716	-	-	8,716
2001	MLK Park and Ride		42,528	-	-	42,528
2005	Computer Hardware/Software Upgrade		2,749	-	-	2,749
2006	Design Quadrant Gates		14,310	-	-	14,310
2006	Compton Creek		120,000	-	-	120,000
2006	Kingston Computer Hardware		23,064	-	-	23,064
2006	Trails, Greenleaf Boulevard		253,535	-	-	253,535
2006	Compton Creek Multi-Purpose Trial		93,129	-	-	93,129
2006	Painting of the Dollaride Community		19,175	-	-	19,175
	Center					
2006	Machinery and Equipment		29,209	-	-	29,209
2010	MLK Transit Center		483,937	-	-	483,937
2010	Safe Route to School Project	_	130,622	 -	 -	 130,622
	Total	\$	3,650,734	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,650,734

# NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2015 and 2014

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

Fund Accounting

The operations of the Proposition A Local Return Fund (PALRF) and Proposition C Local Return Funds (PCLRF) 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.

Basis of Accounting

PALRF and PCLRF 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.

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.

Unrealized Gain (Loss)

In accordance with GASB Statement No. 31, Accounting and Financial Reporting for Certain Investments and External Investment Pools, local governments are required to use fair value (instead of amortized costs) for financial reporting purposes. As a result of such implementation, the City recognizes the unrealized gain (loss) on its external investment pools.

#### NOTE 2 – ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

The financial statements reflect only the financial position and results of operations of the PALRF and PCLRF and their compliance with the Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Program Guidelines.

# 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.

# NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2015 and 2014 (Continued)

#### **NOTE 4 – CASH AND INVESTMENTS**

The PALRF and PCLRF 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.

#### NOTE 5 – PROPOSTION A DISCRETIONARY INCENTIVE GRANT

The City entered into various Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) agreements with Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) to receive Proposition A discretionary incentive grants for participating in the Consolidated National Transit Database (NTD) Voluntary Reporting. The amounts received for the years ended June 30, 2015 and 2014 consisted of the following:

Agreement		NTD	MOU		Amount			
<u>Date</u>	<u>Period</u>	Voluntary	<u>Amount</u>	Re	ed			
		Reporting						
					<u>2015</u>		2014	
May 21, 2014	7/1/13 - 6/30/15	FY 2011-12	\$ 56,642	\$	56,642	\$	-	
May 22, 2013	7/1/12 - 6/30/14	FY 2010-11	\$ 59,122		-		59,122	
Total				\$	56,642	\$	59,122	

Proposition A discretionary incentive grant received in fiscal year ended June 30, 2014 in the amount of \$59,122 was not reported in prior fiscal year but in the current fiscal year as a prior period adjustment in Note 7.

The Proposition A discretionary incentive grants were recorded under PALRF.

#### NOTE 6 - PROJECT GENERATED REVENUE - PALRF

Project generated revenues for the years ended June 30, 2015 and June 30, 2014 for PALRF amounted to \$78,997 and \$90,208, respectively. These revenues consisted of passenger fares from its Fixed Route and Dial-A-Ride services.

# NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2015 and 2014 (Continued)

#### NOTE 7 - PRIOR PERIOD ADJUSTMENT - PALRF and PCLRF

#### **PALRF**

The opening balance at July 1, 2014 for PALRF reflects an understatement in fund balance by \$59,122. This amount represents a prior year understatement of Proposition A discretionary incentive grant revenue in the amount of \$59,122. The result is a restatement of the beginning fund balance account in the financial statement adjusted to \$664,974 for the year ended June 30, 2015.

#### **PCLRF**

The opening balance at July 1, 2014 for PCLRF reflects an overstatement in fund balance by \$267,180. This amount represents additional expenditures incurred for Traffic Signals Upgrade and TMOC project in fiscal year ended June 30, 2014. The result is a restatement of the beginning fund balance account in the financial statement adjusted to \$4,434,989 for the year ended June 30, 2015.

#### NOTE 8 – PROPOSITION C CAPITAL RESERVE

#### 400-01 Traffic Signals Upgrade and TMOC Project

On June 30, 2014, LACMTA and the City entered into an agreement, CRA.PCCOMP14, to establish a capital reserve account (Account) in the amount of \$1,184,100 for the Traffic Signal Upgrade and TMOC Project. If the project is not completed by June 30, 2017, any unexpended funds shall lapse and be returned to LACMTA.

Per the agreement, all interest is accrued and placed in the capital reserve account for use exclusively for the Traffic Signals Upgrade and TMOC Project.

The City completely spent the reserved funds of \$1,184,100 for the Traffic Signals Upgrade and TMOC Project in fiscal year 2014-15. The total expenditures incurred for the project as of June 30, 2015 was \$3,079,895. The project is expected to be completed in February 2016.

### **NOTE 9 – SUBSEQUENT EVENTS**

The City has evaluated events or transactions that occurred subsequent to June 30, 2015 through February 24, 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.



# SIMPSON & SIMPSON CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

FOUNDING PARTNERS BRAINARD C. SIMPSON, CPA 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 Compton, 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) and Proposition C Local Return Fund (PCLRF) of the City of Compton, California (City), as of and for the year ended June 30, 2015, and the related notes to the financial statements, and have issued our report thereon dated February 24, 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 opinion 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 a combination of deficiencies, in internal control, such that there is a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement of the City's PALRF and PCLRF 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 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 audit, and accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. The results of our tests disclosed no instances of noncompliance or other matters that is 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 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.

Los Angeles, California

Simpson & Simpson

February 24, 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 Compton, California and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transit Authority

#### **Report on Compliance**

We have audited the compliance of the City of Compton, California (City) with the Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Guidelines (collectively, the Guidelines) for the year ended June 30, 2015.

#### 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 the Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Fund 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. Our audit does not provide a legal determination of the City's compliance with those requirements.

#### Opinion on Each Local Return Fund

In our opinion, the City of Compton complied, in all material respects, with the compliance requirements referred to above that apply to Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Fund for the year ended June 30, 2015.





#### Other Matters

The results of our auditing procedures disclosed an instance of noncompliance, which is required to be reported in accordance with the Guidelines and which is described in the accompanying Schedule of Findings and Recommendations as Finding No. 15-01. Our opinion on the Proposition C Local Return Fund is not modified with respect to this matter.

The City's response to the noncompliance finding identified in our audit is described in the accompanying Schedule of Findings and Recommendations. The City's response was not subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of compliance and, accordingly, we express no opinion on the response.

#### **Report on Internal Control Over Compliance**

Management of the City of Compton 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 Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Fund 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 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 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 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.

Los Angeles, California February 24, 2016

Simpson & Simpson

18

# COMPLIANCE MATRIX

Year Ended June 30, 2015

Compliance Requirement		In Compliance		Questioned	If no, provide details and
			No	Costs	management response.
A. P	roposition A and Proposition C I	Local R	eturn F	unds	
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	See Finding No. 15-01 at the Schedule of Findings and Recommendations.
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) and listing of Recreational Transit Services, if applicable, were 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 were properly credited to the PALRF and PCLRF accounts.	X		None	

# SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS June 30, 2015

Finding No. 15-01 – Fund: PCLRF

#### Criteria:

According to Proposition C Local Return Guidelines, Section I (C), Project Description Form (Form A), Item 5: "Jurisdictions shall submit for approval a Project Description Form prior to the expenditure of funds for: a 25 percent or greater change in an approved Local Return project budget or scope on all operating or capital Local Return projects."

#### Condition:

The City exceeded more than 25 percent of Metro's approved budget on PCLRF Project Code 400-01, Traffic Signals Upgrade and TMOC and Project Code 440-28, Street Improvement and Maintenance, in the amount of \$1,437,033 and \$230,748, respectively. However, the City filed the Project Description Form (Form A) to obtain the approval for these projects from LACMTA. The revised Form A's were subsequently approved by LACMTA on October 8, 2015.

#### Cause:

Due to City personnel turnover in key budgeting areas in the past two to three years, coordination of operating and capital budgeting for City-wide and program budgets has undergone procedural changes to its budget development processes.

#### Effect:

The City's PCLRF project expenditures exceeded 25 percent of LACMTA's approved budget without LACMTA's approval and the City did not comply with the Guidelines.

#### Questioned Costs:

None

#### Recommendation:

We recommend that the City establish procedures to ensure that project expenditures are within the 25 percent cap of the LACMTA's approved budget and an amended Form A (Project Description Form) is properly prepared and submitted prior to the expenditure of funds which would result in a 25 percent or greater change in an approved Local Return project budget or scope on all operating or capital Local Return projects.

#### Management's Response:

The City is continually striving to improve budget coordination within City departments and outside agencies. A new budget officer was appointed in fiscal year 2014-15 to make budget improvements.



# PROPOSITION A AND PROPOSITION C LOCAL RETURN FUND EXIT CONFERENCE June 30, 2015

An exit conference was held on March 14, 2016 via telephone conference. Those in attendance were:

#### Simpson & Simpson Representative:

Yung Dang, Semi-Senior Auditor

#### City's Representative:

Roel Briones, Internal Auditor

#### Matters Discussed:

Results of the audit disclosed no significant control deficiencies and one (1) non-compliance issue with LACMTA's Guidelines.

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

Stephen Ajobiewe, City Controller Roel Briones, Internal Auditor Roosevelt Peters, Accountant I