

City of La Verne 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 Years Ended June 30, 2015 and 2014 with Report of Independent Auditors



An Independently Owned Member MCGLADREY ALLIANCE



<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	3 4 5 6
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	7 8 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	15 16
Notes to Funds Financial Statements	17
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>	20
COMPLIANCE SECTION	
Report of Independent Auditors on Compliance Compliance Matrix	22 24
EXIT CONFERENCE	28

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 La Verne, 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 La Verne, California (the City) which comprise the Funds' balance sheets as of June 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.



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 La Verne, 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 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, 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 December 21, 2015 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.

& Company LLP

Los Angeles, California December 21, 2015

		Jur	ne 30	1
		2015		2014
ASSETS				
Cash and investments	\$	454,434	\$	374,398
Interest receivable		695		406
То	tal assets \$	455,129	_	374,804
LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCE				
Liabilities				
Accounts payable	\$	56,900	\$	10,573
Accrued salaries and benefits		1,159		1,312
Total	liabilities	58,059	• —	11,885
Frond Inclose				
Fund balance				
Restricted		397,070		362,919
Total fund	d balance	397,070		362,919
Total liabilities and fund	d balance \$	455,129	\$	374,804

		Years ende	d June 30
		2015	2014
Revenues Proposition A Investment income	\$	566,654 \$ 2,133	543,793 1,118
Total revenues	. —	568,787	544,911
Expenditures Various projects Total expenditures		534,636 534,636	569,067 569,067
Excess (deficiency) of revenues over expenditures		34,151	(24,156)
Fund balance at beginning of year		362,919	387,075
Fund balance at end of year	\$	<u>397,070</u> \$	362,919

See notes to financial statements.

City of La Verne Proposition A Local Return Fund Supplementary Information Schedule of Expenditures – Actual and LACMTA Approved Project Budget Year ended June 30, 2015 Actual for 2014

				2015				
Project Code	Project Name		LACMTA Budget	Actual		Variance Positive (Negative)	2014 Actual	
120-10	Get About Pass Subsidy	\$	6,500 \$	6,970	\$	(470) \$	5,015	
130-02	Get About Paratransit		170,856	170,855		1	158,508	
140-13	Recreational Excursions		20,500	24,830		(4,330)	22,101	
250-09	Senior Bus Pass Subsidy		800	1,360	*	(560)	1,610	
250-11	Metrolink Pass Subsidy		49,000	39,825		9,175	40,823	
250-12	Bus Pass Subsidy (FHT)		1,700	7,719	*	(6,019)	5,783	
290-12	SGV Council of Governments		5,300	5,300		-	5,300	
405-20	Prop A Fund Trade City of Industry		250,000	250,000		-	300,000	
480-01	Administration		24,985	27,777		(2,792)	29,927	
	Total expenditures	\$	529,641 \$	534,636	\$	(4,995) \$	569,067	

* See Compliance Matrix.

See report of independent auditors.

Date Acquired		Description			Balance July 1, 2014		_Additions		Deletions	 Balance June 30, 2015	
	None		Total	\$_ \$_		\$ \$		-Ψ	-	\$	-

See report of independent auditors.

		Jur	ne 30)
		2015	_	2014
	ASSETS			
Cash and investments	\$	976,837	\$	806,661
Interest receivable		1,683		961
	Total assets \$	978,520	\$	807,622
LIABILITIE	S AND FUND BALANCE			
Liabilities				
Accounts payable	\$	18,398	\$	18,079
Accrued salaries and	benefits	3,154		2,470
	Total liabilities	21,552		20,549
Fund balance				
Restricted		956,968		787,073
	Total fund balance	956,968		787,073
	Total liabilities and fund balance \$	978,520	\$	807,622

See notes to financial statements.

		Years end	ded June 30
		2015	2014
Revenues			
Proposition C	\$	470,950	\$ 451,902
Investment income		5,841	3,480
Rental income		35,000	-
	Total revenues	511,791	455,382
Expenditures Various projects		341,896	328,791
	Total expenditures	341,896	328,791
Excess of revenues over expen	ditures	169,895	126,591
Fund balance at beginning of y	ear	787,073	660,482
Fund balance at end of year	\$	956,968	\$787,073

See notes to financial statements.

City of La Verne Proposition C Local Return Fund Supplementary Information Schedule of Expenditures – Actual and LACMTA Approved Project Budget Year ended June 30, 2015 Actual for 2014

Project Code	Project Name	LACMTA Budget	 Actual	Variance Positive (Negative)	2014 Actual
130-02	Get About Paratransit \$	170,856	\$ 170,856	s - \$	158,508
140-06	Community Education	23,000	23,000	-	23,000
150-01	Bus Stop Improvements	60,000	54,082	5,918	-
160-14	Bus Stop Maintenance	9,756	10,166	(410)	9,958
200-03	Get About Capital Outlay	20,000	20,000	-	19,500
270-01	Blue Line Station Feasibility Study	1	-	1	3,000
280-15	Community Newsletter	4,000	4,000	-	3,000
310-07	Transit Store Annex	30,926	32,368	(1,442)	29,894
410-08	Transportation Demand Management	500	-	500	-
460-01	"D & Dover Traffic Signal	150,000	-	150,000	50,000
480-04	Administration	29,576	 27,424	2,152	31,931
	Total expenditures \$	498,615	\$ 341,896	5 156,719 \$	328,791

City of La Verne Proposition C Local Return Fund Supplementary Information Schedule of Capital Assets Year ended June 30, 2015

Date Acquired	Description	Balance July 1, 2014	Additions	Deletions	Balance June 30, 2015
Jun-94	Land Downtown Transportation Info Center \$	79,736	\$-\$	- \$	79,736
Sep-95	Bench 6' Long	12,490	-	-	12,490
Feb-01	Motorola MCS2000 High Spec Mobile Radio	2,254	-	-	2,254
Mar-01	01 Ford E-350 SD Prisoner Transport Van	32,913	-	-	32,913
Nov-04	Bus Shelter - Foothill and Bradford	16,350	-	-	16,350
Dec-13	City Hall Parking Lot Rehab	50,000	-	-	50,000
	Total \$	193,743	\$\$	- \$	193,743

		Ju	ne 30	
	—	2015		2014
	ASSETS			
Cash and investments	\$	248,349	\$	529,843
Interest receivable		605		622
	Total assets \$	248,954	\$	530,465
LIABILITIES /	AND FUND BALANCE			
Liabilities				
Accounts payable	\$	-	\$	-
	Total liabilities	-		-
Fund balance				
Restricted		248,954		530,465
	Total fund balance	248,954		530,465
Т	otal liabilities and fund balance $\$$	248,954	\$	530,465

See notes to financial statements.

			Years ended	June 30
			2015	2014
Revenues				
Measure R	\$	5	352,599 \$	336,624
Investment income			2,954	1,855
	Total revenues		355,553	338,479
Expenditures Various projects	Total expenditures		637,064 637,064	-
Excess (deficiency) of revenues over	r expenditures		(281,511)	338,479
Fund balance at beginning of year			530,465	191,986
Fund balance at end of year	\$	s	<u>248,954</u> \$	530,465

		2015					
Project Code	Project Name		LACMTA Budget	Actual	. <u>-</u>	Variance Positive (Negative)	2014 Actual
01-001 01-002	Virginia Ave Street Rehabilitation Street Repair and Maintenance - Old Ranch	\$	350,000 \$	335,286	\$	14,714 \$	-
01 002	Road Area ARAM	_	-	301,778	*	(301,778)	-
	Total expenditures	\$_	350,000 \$	637,064	\$	(287,064) \$	-

* See Compliance Matrix.

Date Acquired		Description		Balance July 1, 2014		Additions		Deletions		Balance June 30, 2015
	None	Total	\$_ \$_		\$_ \$	-	\$ \$	- (\$_ \$_	<u>-</u>

		June	30
		2015	2014
Cash and investments	ASSETS \$ Total assets \$	<u>-</u> \$ \$	376 376
Liabilities	S AND FUND BALANCE		
Accounts payable	\$_ Total liabilities	<u> </u>	
Fund balance			
Restricted		-	376
	Total fund balance	-	376
	Total liabilities and fund balance \$	- \$	376

See notes to financial statements.

		Years end	ded	June 30
		2015		2014
Revenues Intergovernmental Allocations: Article 3 Investment income Total revenues	\$ 	- 1 1	\$	- 1 1
Expenditures Construction/Maintenance Total expenditures	;	-		-
Excess of revenues over expenditures		1		1
Other financing use Funds returned to LACMTA, including interest		(377)		
Excess (deficiency) of revenues over expenditures and other final	anc	(376)		1
Fund balance at beginning of year		376		375
Fund balance at end of year	\$	-	\$	376

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) on investments.

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, 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 monthly 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 FUND EXCHANGE

As permitted under the Guidelines and as approved by LACMTA, the City entered into agreements to exchange its uncommitted Proposition A Local Return monies as follows:

- In August 2014, the City entered into an agreement with the City of Industry to exchange the City's PALRF monies amounting to \$250,000 for \$187,500 general fund monies or \$0.75 general fund monies per \$1 of PALRF monies.
- In July 2013, the City entered into an agreement with the City of Industry to exchange the City's PALRF monies amounting to \$300,000 for \$228,000 general fund monies or \$0.76 general fund monies per \$1 of PALRF monies.

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 June 30, 2015 and 2014, the City has funds on reserve as follows:

	2015	2014
FY 2011/12 reserve	\$ 16,419	\$ 16,419
FY 2012/13 reserve	24,238	24,238
FY 2013/14 reserve	25,972	25,972
FY 2014/15 allocation	21,156	-
	\$ 87,785	\$ 66,629

There were no TDA Article 3 drawdowns for the years ended June 30, 2015 and 2014.

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 June 30, 2015. There were no funds that lapsed in FY 2014/15.

NOTE 9 SUBSEQUENT EVENTS

The City has evaluated subsequent events through December 21, 2015, 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 La Verne, 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 La Verne, California (the 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 December 21, 2015.

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.

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, 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.

Vargues & Company LLP

Los Angeles, California December 21, 2015

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 La Verne, California and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Report on Compliance

We have audited the compliance of the City of La Verne, 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, 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 La Verne, California complied, in all material respects, with the compliance requirements of the Guidelines for the year ended June 30, 2015.



Other Matters

The results of our auditing procedures disclosed instances of noncompliance with the requirements, which are described in the accompanying Compliance Matrix. Our opinion is not modified with respect to these matters.

The City's responses to the noncompliance findings identified in our audit are described in the accompanying Compliance Matrix. The City's responses were not subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of compliance, and accordingly, we express no opinion on the responses.

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 preceding paragraph and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control over compliance that might be material weaknesses or significant deficiencies and therefore, material weaknesses or significant deficiencies may exist that were not identified. We identified a deficiency in internal control over compliance, as described in the accompanying Compliance Matrix as Finding #2015-002, that we consider to be a material weakness.

The City's responses to the internal control over compliance findings identified in our audit are described in the accompanying Compliance Matrix. The City's responses were not subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of compliance and, accordingly, we express no opinion on the responses.

The purpose of this report on internal control over compliance is solely to describe the scope of our testing of internal control over compliance and the results of that testing based on the requirements of the Guidelines. Accordingly, this report is not suitable for any other purpose.

& Company LLP

Los Angeles, California December 21, 2015

Compliance Requirements		In Compliance		Questioned	If no, provide details and	
			No	Costs	management response.	
Α.						
	Local Return Funds	X				
	1. Timely use of funds.	Х		None		
	2. Expenditures approved before	Ň				
	being incurred.	Х		None	F ' I ' I '0045.004	
I	3. Expenditures did not exceed				Finding #2015-001	
	25% of LACMTA's approved		v	¢E OE A	DALDE	
	budget.		Х	\$5,954	PALRE	
					The City exceeded LACMTA's approved budget by more than 25% for the following projects:	
					a. Project code 250-09, Senior Bus Pass Subsidy (\$360), and	
					b. Project code 250-12, Bus Pass Subsidy (FHT) (\$5,594).	
					Projects with greater than 25% change from the approved project budget should be amended by submitting an amended Project Description Form (Form A).	
					LACMTA Program Manager granted a retroactive approval on the amended budget for the said projects on December 18, 2015.	
					We recommend that the City submit to LACMTA Program Manager a Form A to obtain approval for the change in project budget, and that the City implement controls to ascertain compliance at all times.	

		Compliance Requirements		In pliance No	Questioned Costs	If no, provide details and management response.		
Α.	A. Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds (Continued)		165					
		Expenditures did not exceed 25% of LACMTA's approved budget. (Continued)				Management Response The Senior Bus Pass Subsidy, Project Code 250-09 and Bus Pass Subsidy, Project Code 250-12 budget request amounts were reduced in error. New Form A's were sent to MTA requesting approval for the change in project budget and was approved on December 18, 2015.		
		Administrative expenses are within the 20% cap.	х		None			
	5.	All on-going and carryover projects were reported on Form B.	x		None			
	6.	Annual Project Summary Report (Form B) was submitted on time.	x		None			
	7.	Annual Expenditure Report (Form C) was submitted on time.	x		None			
	8.	Cash or cash equivalents are maintained.	x		None			
	9.	Accounting procedures, record keeping and documentation are adequate.	x		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.	x		None			
	3.	Signed Assurances and Understandings on file.	х		None			
	4.	Separate Measure R Local Return Account was established.	x		None			

Compliance Requirements		In Compliance		Questioned	If no, provide details and	
	compliance Requirements	Yes No		Costs	management response.	
В.	Measure R Local Return Fund					
	(Continued)					
	5. Revenues received including allocations, project generated revenues and interest income was properly credited to the Measure R Local Return	×				
	Account.	Х		None	5 '	
	Account. 6. Funds were expended with LACMTA's approval.		X	\$301,778	Finding #2015-002The City claimed expenditures for Project code 01-002 Street Repairs and Maintenance – Old Ranch Road Area ARAM project totaling \$301,778 with no prior approval from LACMTA.Although we found the expenditures to be eligible for MRLRF funding, this project had no prior approval from LACMTA.LACMTA Program Manager granted a retroactive approval of the said projects on December 15, 2015.We recommend for the City to establish procedures and controls to ensure that approval is obtained from LACMTA prior to implementing any Measure R- funded projects.Management Response	
					The Project code 01-002 was originally submitted and approved in FY2013/14. Our Public Works Director was under the belief that once the funds were approved and encumbered in FY 2013/14 that he did not need to include the project in the FY2014/15 Form One. We have submitted another Form One to LACMTA and Project 01-002 is included in this Form One for FY2014/15. We received approval for the Form One from MTA or December 15, 2015.	

Compliance Requirements		n bliance	Questioned	If no, provide details and management response.	
		No	Costs		
B. Measure R Local Return Fund (Continued)					
7. Expenditure Plan (Form One)					
was submitted on time.	х		None		
8. Expenditure Report (Form Two)	~		NONE		
was submitted on time.	х		None		
9. Timely use of funds.	X		None		
10. Administrative expenses are	~		NULLE		
within the 20% cap.	Х		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				Not applicable. No expenditures	
amenities.				in FY 2014/15.	

EXIT CONFERENCE

An exit conference was held on December 21, 2015 with City of La Verne representatives. Those in attendance were:

Vasquez & Company LLP representatives: Roger A. Martinez – Partner Marialyn Salvador – Audit Manager

City of La Verne representatives: Richard Martinez – Finance Officer Christy Lopez – Accountant

Matters discussed:

Results of the audit disclosed issues of noncompliance with the Guidelines.

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

Richard Martinez – Finance Officer Christy Lopez – Accountant



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 RSM[™] is used under license by RSM US LLP.