

City of El Segundo 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 the Years Ended September 30, 2015 and 2014 with Report of Independent Auditors



An Independently Owned Member MCGLADREY ALLIANCE



<u>PAGE</u>

| FINANCIAL SECTION | ON |
|-------------------|----|
|-------------------|----|

| 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 | 3 4 5 6 |
| Proposition C Local Return Fund: Basic Financial Statements: Balance Sheets Statements of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance | 7 8 |
| Supplementary Information: Schedule of Expenditures – Actual and LACMTA Approved Project Budget Schedule of Capital Assets | 9 10 |
| 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 | 11 12 13 14 |
| 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 | 15 16 17 |
| Notes to Funds Financial Statements | 18 |
| 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> | 22 |
| Schedule of Findings on Internal Control over Financial Reporting and on Compliance | 24 |
| COMPLIANCE SECTION | |
| Report of Independent Auditors on Compliance Compliance Matrix | 25 27 |
| EXIT CONFERENCE | 29 |

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 El Segundo, 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 El Segundo, California (the City) which comprise the Funds' balance sheets as of September 30, 2015 and 2014, and the related statements of revenues, expenditures and changes in fund balance for the years 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.



Opinion

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 El Segundo, California, as of September 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 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 September 30, 2015 and 2014, and the changes in its financial position for the years 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 April 28, 2016 on our consideration of the City'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, and 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.

Vargues & Company LLP

Los Angeles, California April 28, 2016

| | | September 30 | | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|----|---------|--|
| | | 2015 | | 2014 | |
| | ASSETS | | | | |
| Cash and investments | \$ | 413,468 | \$ | 337,990 | |
| | Total assets \$ | 413,468 | \$ | 337,990 | |
| LIABILITIES / | AND FUND BALANCE | | | | |
| Liabilities | | | | | |
| Accounts payable | \$ | 6,261 | \$ | 8,162 | |
| Accrued liabilities | | 3,513 | | 4,362 | |
| | Total liabilities | 9,774 | | 12,524 | |
| Fund balance | | | | | |
| Restricted | | 403,694 | | 325,466 | |
| | Total fund balance | 403,694 | | 325,466 | |
| Т | otal liabilities and fund balance \$ | 413,468 | \$ | 337,990 | |

| | | Years ended September 30 | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | - | 2015 | 2014 | | | |
| Revenues Proposition A Investment income Project generated revenue Reimbursement from Torrance MAX | \$ Total revenues | 299,781 \$ 4,671 3,350 - - 307,802 | 287,380 3,079 725 21,281 312,465 | | | |
| | Total revenues | 307,802 | 312,405 | | | |
| Expenditures | | | | | | |
| Various projects | - | 229,574 | 272,709 | | | |
| | Total expenditures | 229,574 | 272,709 | | | |
| Excess of revenues over expenditures | | 78,228 | 39,756 | | | |
| Fund balance at beginning of year | | 325,466 | 285,710 | | | |
| Fund balance at end of year | - \$_ | 403,694 \$ | 325,466 | | | |

| | | · · · | | | |
|-----------------|----------------------------|------------------|------------|------------------------------------|----------------|
| Project Code | Project Name | LACMTA Budget | Actual | Variance Positive (Negative) | 2014 Actual |
| 110-01 | Beach Shuttle \$ | 21,700 \$ | 22,743 \$ | (1,043) \$ | 32,222 |
| 120-03 | Dial-A-Ride | 204,300 | 176,005 | 28,295 | 188,918 |
| 140-02 | Recreation Trips | 25,600 | 16,988 | 8,612 | 24,016 |
| 180-01 | Equipment Replacement Fund | 19,725 | - | 19,725 | - |
| 250-05 | MTA Pass Buy Down | 4,000 | 4,085 | (85) | 2,825 |
| 480-04 | Prop A Administration | 38,100 | 9,753 | 28,347 | 24,728 |
| | Total expenditures \$ | 313,425 \$ | 229,574 \$ | 83,851 \$ | 272,709 |

| Date Acquired | Description | Balance October 1, 2014 | Additions | Deletion | <u>s</u> | Balance September 30, 2015 |
|------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------------------------------|
| 1995 | Mini Bus (Unit # 6474) | 47,293 | \$- | \$ 47,29 | 3\$ | - |
| 1997 | Mini Bus (Unit # 6476) | 22,133 | - | | - | 22,133 |
| 2001 | Computer | 2,884 | - | 2,88 | 4 | - |
| 2003 | Mini Bus (Unit # 6481) | 63,783 | - | | - | 63,783 |
| 2011 | Mini Bus (Unit # 6480) | 57,273 | - | | - | 57,273 |
| 2011 | Mini Bus (Unit # 6486) | 57,273 | - | | - | 57,273 |
| | Total S | 250,639 | \$ | \$ 50,17 | 7_\$ | 200,462 |

| Sept | September 30 | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| 2015 | | 2014 | | |
| | | | | |
| \$575,038 | \$ | 513,616 | | |
| s \$575,038 | \$ | 513,616 | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| A A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A B A | • | 00.000 | | |
| | • | 93,606 | | |
| 1,402 | | 2,428 | | |
| 2,795 | | 4,397 | | |
| s 5,964 | <u> </u> | 100,431 | | |
| | | | | |
| 569.074 | | 413,185 | | |
| | | 413,185 | | |
| | | 513,616 | | |
| | 2015 \$ <u>575,038</u> \$ <u>1,767</u> 1,402 2,795 \$ <u>5,964</u> e <u>569,074</u> | 2015 s \$ <u>575,038</u> \$ s \$ <u>575,038</u> \$ s <u>1,767</u> \$ 1,402 2,795 s <u>5,964</u> e <u>569,074</u> | | |

See notes to financial statements.

| | | Years ended September 30 | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--|--|--|
| | _ | 2015 | 2014 | | | |
| Revenues | | | | | | |
| Proposition C | \$ | 248,509 \$ | 238,268 | | | |
| Investment income | | 6,254 | 4,010 | | | |
| | Total revenues | 254,763 | 242,278 | | | |
| Expenditures Various projects | Total expenditures | 98,874 98,874 | 170,632 170,632 | | | |
| Excess of revenues over expenditures | | 155,889 | 71,646 | | | |
| Fund balance at beginning of year | - | 413,185 | 341,539 | | | |
| Fund balance at end of year | \$ _ | <u>569,074</u> \$ | 413,185 | | | |

| | | - | | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------------|----|------------------|--------------|----|------------------------------------|----------------|
| Project Code | Project Name | - | LACMTA Budget | Actual | - | Variance Positive (Negative) | 2014 Actual |
| 110-03 | Beach Cities Transit (BCT) \$ | \$ | 27,000 | \$ 16,591 | \$ | 10,409 \$ | 24,237 |
| 110-04 | Lunchtime Shuttle | | 67,618 | 49,298 | | 18,320 | 55,303 |
| 180-01 | Equipment Replacement Fund | | 4,600 | - | | 4,600 | - |
| 440-03 | Arterial Streets Rehabilitation Program | | 120,000 | 32,048 | | 87,952 | 87,952 |
| 480-07 | Prop C Administration | | 21,729 | 937 | _ | 20,792 | 3,140 |
| | Total expenditures \$ | \$ | 240,947 | \$ 98,874 | \$ | 142,073 \$ | 170,632 |

See report of independent auditors.

| Date Acquired | Description | Balance October 1, 2014 | | Additions | Deletio | ons | | Balance September 30, 2015 |
|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|-----------|---------|-----|------------|----------------------------------|
| 2003 | Mini Bus (Unit #6482) Total | \$ 64,417 64,417 | _\$_ _\$_ | - 9 | · | - | _\$ _\$ | 64,417 64,417 |

| | September 30 | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|----|---------|--|--|
| | 2015 | | 2014 | | |
| ASSETS | | | | | |
| Cash and investments \$ | 617,431 | \$ | 625,988 | | |
| Due from LACMTA | 17,609 | | 16,946 | | |
| Total assets \$ | 635,040 | \$ | 642,934 | | |
| LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCE | | | | | |
| Liabilities | | | | | |
| Accounts payable \$ | 18,760 | \$ | 134,235 | | |
| Contract retention payable | 7,065 | _ | 7,065 | | |
| Total liabilities | 25,825 | | 141,300 | | |
| Fund balance | | | | | |
| Restricted | 609,215 | | 501,634 | | |
| Total fund balance | 609,215 | | 501,634 | | |
| Total liabilities and fund balance \$ | 635,040 | \$ | 642,934 | | |

| | Years ended September 30 | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|
| | 2015 | 2014 | | |
| Revenues Measure R Local Return Fund \$ | 186,596 \$ | 178,077 | | |
| Investment income | 6,515 | 891 | | |
| Measure R Highway Program Grant | - | 2,157,576 | | |
| | 193,111 | 2,336,544 | | |
| Expenditures Project expenditures funded by MRLRF Project expenditures funded by Measure R Highway Program Grant Total expenditures | - 85,530 85,530 | 141,300 720,905 862,205 | | |
| Excess of revenues over expenditures | 107,581 | 1,474,339 | | |
| (Unassigned) fund balance at beginning of year | 501,634 | (972,705) | | |
| Fund balance at end of year \$ | 609,215 \$ | 501,634 | | |

| | | | 2015 | | |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|----------|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Project Code | Project Name | LACMTA Budget | Actual | Variance Positive (Negative) | 2014 Actual |
| 01-001 | Street Repair and Maintenance \$\$ Total expenditures \$\$ | \$_ \$ | \$ \$ | \$\$ | 141,300 141,300 |

| Date Acquired | | Description | Balance ctober 1, 2014 | | Additions | Deletions | S | Balance eptember 30, 2015 |
|------------------|------|-------------|------------------------------|-----|-----------|---------------|-----|---------------------------------|
| Acquired | | Description | 2014 | - | Additions | Deletions | | 2015 |
| | None | | \$ - : | \$_ | - | \$ _ | \$ | |
| | | Total | \$ - | \$_ | - | \$ - | \$_ | - |

See report of independent auditors.

| | | Septe | r 30 | |
|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------|------|--------|
| | - | 2015 | | 2014 |
| | ASSETS | | | |
| Cash and investments | \$ | 58,642 | \$ | 10,655 |
| Due from LACMTA | | 925 | | - |
| | Total assets \$ _ | 59,567 | _\$ | 10,655 |
| LIABILITIE: Liabilities Accounts payable | S AND FUND BALANCE S AND FUND BALANCE | - | _\$ | - |
| Fund balance | | | | |
| Restricted | - | 59,567 | | 10,655 |
| | Total fund balance | 59,567 | | 10,655 |
| | Total liabilities and fund balance \$ _ | 59,567 | _\$ | 10,655 |

| | _ | Years ended September 30 | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------|--------|
| | - | 2015 | _ | 2014 |
| Revenues | | | | |
| Intergovernmental Allocations: | | | | |
| Article 3 | \$ | 59,324 | \$ | 9,850 |
| Interest income | | 301 | _ | 45 |
| | Total revenues | 59,625 | | 9,895 |
| | | | | |
| Expenditures | | | | |
| Construction/Maintenance | Totol ovnondituroo | - | | - |
| | Total expenditures | - | | |
| Excess of revenues over expenditu | ires | 59,625 | | 9,895 |
| | | , | | -, |
| Other financing use | | | | |
| Funds returned to LACMTA | | (10,713) | <u> </u> | - |
| | | | | |
| Excess of revenues over expenditu | ures and | 10.010 | | 0.005 |
| other financing use | | 48,912 | | 9,895 |
| Fund balance at beginning of year | | 10,655 | | 760 |
| | - | 10,000 | | , 30 |
| Fund balance at end of year | \$_ | 59,567 | _\$ | 10,655 |

City of El Segundo Transportation Development Act Article 3 Fund Supplementary Information Schedule of Transportation Development Act Allocation for Specific Projects Pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 99234 Year ended September 30, 2015

| | | | | Totals to Date | | |
|------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Project Description | | Program Year | Allocations | Expenditures | Unexpended Allocations | Project Status |
| Local Allocations: | | | | | | |
| Bikeways Installation | Totals | \$ \$ | 59,324 59,324 | · · | <u> </u> | Ongoing |
| Unexpended interest accumul | ated to date | | | | 301 | |
| Funds returned to LACMTA, in | nterest included | | | | (10,713) | |
| Fund balance at beginning of | year | | | | 10,655 | |
| Fund balance at end of year | | | | \$ | 59,567 * | |

* The fund balance of \$59,567 was encumbered as of September 30, 2015.

See notes to financial statements.

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 pooled with other City monies in the Special Revenue Fund. The Special Revenue Fund accounts for the City's share of the Transportation Development Act Article 3 allocations which are legally restricted for specific purposes.

Basis of Accounting

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.

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) on Investments

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) investments.

Reclassifications

Certain amounts in the 2014 financial statements have been reclassified to conform to the 2015 presentation.

NOTE 2 ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

The financial statements present only the Proposition A Local Return Fund, Proposition C Local Return Fund, Measure R Local Return Fund and Transportation Development Act Article 3 Fund, and do not purport to, and do not present fairly the City's financial position as of September 30, 2015 and 2014, and the changes in its financial position for the years 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 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.

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

NOTE 7 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT ARTICLE 3 FUND REVENUE ALLOCATION

The revenue allocation for the years ended September 30 consisted of the following:

| | 2015 | 2014 |
|---------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| Funds returned to LACMTA, | | |
| excluding interest | \$ - | \$ 9,723 |
| FY 2008/09 allocation | - | 127 |
| FY 2009/10 allocation | 7,356 | - |
| FY 2010/11 allocation | 6,862 | - |
| FY 2011/12 allocation | 8,234 | - |
| FY 2012/13 allocation | 12,142 | - |
| FY 2013/14 allocation | 13,627 | - |
| FY 2014/15 allocation | 11,103 | - |
| | \$ 59,324 | \$ 9,850 |

NOTE 8 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 September 30, the City has funds on reserve as follows:

| | 20 | 15 | 2014 |
|---------------------------------|----|------|--------|
| FY 2009/10 reserve | \$ | - \$ | 7,356 |
| FY 2010/11 reserve | | - | 6,862 |
| FY 2011/12 reserve | | - | 8,234 |
| FY 2012/13 reserve | | - | 12,142 |
| FY 2013/14 reserve | | - | 13,627 |
| Available reserve balance as of | | | |
| September 30 | \$ | \$ | 48,221 |

NOTE 8 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT ARTICLE 3 FUNDS RESERVED (CONTINUED)

For FY 2014/15, any TDA Article 3 funds left on reserve for FY 2010/11 or prior, are subject to lapse if not claimed by the City by September 30, 2015. There were no funds that lapsed in FY 2014/15.

NOTE 9 SUBSEQUENT EVENTS

The City has evaluated subsequent events through April 28, 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 El Segundo, 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 El Segundo, California (the City) as of and for the year ended September 30, 2015, and the related notes to the financial statements, and have issued our report thereon dated April 28, 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 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.

Our consideration of internal control was for the limited purpose described in the preceding paragraph and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control that might be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses and, therefore, material deficiencies or significant deficiencies may exist that were not identified. However, as discussed below, we identified a deficiency in internal control that we consider to be a material weakness.

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 entity's 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 in internal control, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance. We identified a deficiency in internal control described in the Schedule of Findings in Internal Control over Financial Reporting and on Compliance as Finding No. 2015-001 that we consider to be a material weakness.



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*.

The City's Response to the Finding

The City's response to the finding identified in our audit is described previously. The City's response was not subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the financial statements, and accordingly, we express no opinion on the response.

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.

Varques & Company LLP

Los Angeles, California April 28, 2015

Finding No. 2015-001: Cash Management and Bank Reconciliation

Condition

We noted during our audit that the City had not prepared its bank reconciliation statements for approximately eight (8) months subsequent to year end. The reconciliation of bank account balances with accounting records is a necessary element of an effective internal control system for cash. This process should be a routine procedure in the City's accounting process.

Internal control is key to ensuring that account balances are accurate so that financial positions of the municipality is accurate and the City's governing body can make informed decisions. The timely preparation of the monthly bank reconciliation statements enables management to detect and resolve any discrepancies and problems in the account balances within a reasonable period of time.

Cause and Effect

We learned that the City lost several key employees in the finance and accounting department during the fiscal year 2015. As such, there was no proper oversight over the preparation of the bank reconciliation statements. The lack of oversight can lead to the risk that discrepancies will not be detected or resolved in a timely manner, and also can lead to a higher risk of misappropriation.

Criteria

A material weakness is a deficiency or combination of deficiencies in internal controls, that adversely affects the entity's ability to initiate, authorize, record, process, or report financial data reliably in accordance with U.S. GAAP such that there is a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement of the entity's financial statements will not be prevented, or detected and corrected on a timely basis.

Recommendation

Bank and cash reconciliations should be performed monthly to ensure accuracy and accountability for all cash transactions. The City should review its internal control procedures to determine what changes need to be made to ascertain bank accounts are always reconciled on a timely basis. Some changes to consider could be cross-training as well as developing relationships with consultants that could assist the accounting department when employee turnover occurs.

Views of Responsible Officials

The City agrees with the auditor's recommendation that bank and cash reconciliations should be performed monthly. With the turnover of staff, outside consultants were used to perform the bank reconciliations. Permanent city staff will be taking over the role of performing the bank reconciliations on a monthly basis.

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 El Segundo, California and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Report on Compliance

We have audited the compliance of the City of El Segundo, 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 September 30, 2015.

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 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 City of El Segundo, California complied, in all material respects, with the compliance requirements of the Guidelines for the year ended September 30, 2015.



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, 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 is a deficiency or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control over compliance that is less severe than a material weakness in internal control over compliance that is less severe than a material weakness in internal control over compliance that is less severe than a material weakness in internal control over compliance that is less severe than a material weakness in internal control over compliance that is less severe than a material weakness in internal control over compliance that is less severe than a material weakness in internal control over compliance.

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.

green & Company LLP

Los Angeles, California April 28, 2016

| | Compliance Requirements | | ompliance Requirements In Compliance Yes No | | Questioned | If no, provide details and |
|----|-------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|--|------------|----------------------------|
| | | | | | Costs | management response. |
| Α. | | position A and Proposition C cal Return Funds | | | | |
| | 1. | Timely use of funds. | Х | | None | |
| | 2. | Expenditures approved before | | | | |
| | | being incurred. | Х | | None | |
| | 3. | Expenditures did not exceed | | | | |
| | | 25% of LACMTA's approved | | | | |
| | | budget. | Х | | None | |
| | 4. | Administrative expenses are | | | | |
| | | within the 20% cap. | Х | | None | |
| | 5. | All on-going and carryover | | | | |
| | | projects were reported on Form | | | | |
| | | B. | Х | | None | |
| | 6. | Annual Project Summary | | | | |
| | | Report (Form B) was submitted | | | | |
| | | on time. | Х | | None | |
| | 7. | Annual Expenditure Report | | | | |
| | | (Form C) was submitted on | | | | |
| | | time. | Х | | None | |
| | 8. | Cash or cash equivalents are | | | | |
| | | maintained. | Х | | None | |
| | 9. | Accounting procedures, record | | | | |
| | | keeping and documentation are | | | | |
| | | adequate. | Х | | None | |
| В. | Me | asure R Local Return Fund | | | | |
| | 1. | Funds were expended for | | | | |
| | | transportation purposes. | Х | | None | |
| | 2. | Funds were used to augment, | | | | |
| | | not supplant, existing local | | | | |
| | | revenues being used for | | | | |
| | | transportation purposes unless | | | | |
| | | there is a funding shortfall. | Х | | None | |
| | 3. | Signed Assurances and | | | | |
| | | Understandings on file. | Х | | None | |
| | 4. | Separate Measure R Local | | | | |
| | | Return Account was | | | | |
| | | established. | Х | | None | |
| | 5. | Revenues received including | | | | |
| | | allocations, project generated | | | | |
| | | revenues and interest income | | | | |
| | | was properly credited to the | | | | |
| | | Measure R Local Return | | | NL. | |
| | | Account. | Х | | None | |

| | Compliance Requirements | | In oliance | Questioned Costs | If no, provide details and management response. |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|---------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| | | Yes | No | 00313 | management response. |
| В. | Measure R Local Return Fund (Continued) | | | | |
| | Funds were expended with LACMTA's approval. | х | | None | |
| | 7. Expenditure Plan (Form One) was submitted on time. | x | | None | |
| | Expenditure Report (Form Two) was submitted on time. | X | | None | |
| | 9. Timely use of funds. | X | | None | |
| | 10. Administrative expenses are within the 20% cap. | x | | None | |
| | 11. Fund exchanges were approved by LACMTA. | | | | Not applicable. |
| | 12. A separate account was established for Capital reserve funds and Capital reserve was approved by LACMTA. | | | | Not applicable. |
| | 13. Recreational transit form was submitted on time. | | | | Not applicable. |
| C. | Transportation Development Act Article 3 Fund | | | | |
| | 1. Timely use of funds. | Х | | None | |
| | 2. Expenditures were incurred for activities relating to pedestrian and bicycle facilities and | X | | N | |
| | amenities. | Х | | None | |

EXIT CONFERENCE

An exit conference was held on April 28, 2016 with City of El Segundo representatives. Those in attendance were:

Vasquez and Company LLP representatives: Roger Martinez – Audit Partner Marialyn Salvador – Audit Manager

City of El Segundo representative: Joseph Lillio – Finance Director Misty Cheng – Interim Finance Director

Matters discussed:

Results of the audit disclosed a material weakness in internal control over financial reporting.

A copy of this report was forwarded to the following City of El Segundo representatives for comments prior to the issuance of the final report:

Joseph Lillio – Finance Director Misty Cheng – Interim Finance Director



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 publically traded companies. Vasquez is a member of the McGladrey Alliance. McGladrey Alliance is a premier affiliation of independent accounting and consulting firms. McGladrey Alliance provides its members with access to resources of RSM US LLP (formerly known as McGladrey LLP). McGladrey 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. Visit http://www.rsmus.com/aboutus for more information regarding RSM US LLP and RSM International. McGladrey®, the McGladrey Alliance logo and the McGladrey Alliance signatures are proprietary to RSM US LLP, while RSMTM is used under license by RSM US LLP.

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