

City of San Dimas 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



FINANCIAL SECTION	PAGE
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 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>	21
COMPLIANCE SECTION	
Report of Independent Auditors on Compliance Compliance Matrix	23 25
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 San Dimas, 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 San Dimas, 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 San Dimas, 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 March 9, 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.

Vacques & Company LLP

Los Angeles, California March 9, 2016

		June 30			
		2015		2014	
	ASSETS		_		
Cash and investments	\$	481,685	\$	541,635	
Accounts receivable		5,767		-	
	Total assets \$	487,452	\$	541,635	
LIABILITIES	SAND FUND BALANCE				
Liabilities					
Accounts payable	\$	23,334	\$	20,951	
Other liabilities		266		-	
	Total liabilities	23,600		20,951	
Fund balance					
Restricted		463,852		520,684	
	Total fund balance	463,852	_	520,684	
т	otal liabilities and fund balance \$	487,452	\$	541,635	

		Years ended June 30			
		 2015	2014		
Revenues Proposition A Investment income Recreation fees Gain on sale of equipment	total revenues	\$ 595,747 \$ 1,253 1,474 - 598,474	571,712 1,247 - 1,501 574,460		
Expenditures Various projects	Total expenditures	 <u>655,306</u> 655,306	650,363 650,363		
Deficiency of revenues over expenditu	res	(56,832)	(75,903)		
Fund balance at beginning of year		 520,684	596,587		
Fund balance at end of year	:	\$ <u>463,852</u> \$	520,684		

See notes to financial statements.

Project Code	Project Name	 LACMTA Budget	Actual	Variance Positive (Negative)	2014 Actual
120-02	E and H Paratransit (Get About)	\$ 150,516 \$	150,516 \$	- \$	130,203
140-03	Recreation Transit	86,700	75,665	11,035	80,360
170-07	Maintenance of Bus Stop Shelters	14,227	11,476	2,751	9,186
200-16	Vehicle Rental Program	2,500	2,500	-	2,500
200-19	Capital Purchase Van Pro Share	8,500	8,500	-	8,100
240-05	Taxi Subsidy (Dial-A-Cab)	256,000	238,371	17,629	261,547
250-04	MTA/FTC Bus Pass Subsidy	6,000	7,200	(1,200)	4,400
290-08	Rail Station Depot Maintenance	24,000	24,000	-	23,400
290-15	Park and Ride Lot Maintenance	44,450	32,374	12,076	16,710
480-01	Administration	 122,550	104,704	17,846	113,957
	Total expenditures	\$ 715,443 \$	655,306 \$	60,137 \$	650,363

Date Acquired	Description	Balance July 1, 2014	 Additions	Deletions	 Balance June 30, 2015
1994	San Dimas Park and Ride Lot	\$ 742,683	\$ -	\$-	\$ 742,683
1996	Construction - San Dimas Park and Ride Lot	150,395	-	-	150,395
1999	10 Bus Benches	4,250	-	-	4,250
2003	7 Cable Bench Cover	8,050	-	-	8,050
	Total S	\$ 905,378	\$ -	\$	\$ 905,378

See report of independent auditors.

		June 30				
		2015		2014		
	ASSETS					
Cash and investments	\$ _	1,108,014	\$	1,691,923		
	Total assets \$ _	1,108,014	\$	1,691,923		
Liabilities	SAND FUND BALANCE	5 000	¢			
Accounts payable	_\$ Total liabilities	<u> </u>	<u>\$</u>	-		
Fund balance Restricted	Total fund balance _ Total liabilities and fund balance \$	1,103,014 1,103,014 1,108,014	\$	1,691,923 1,691,923 1,691,923		

		Years ended June 30			
		2015	2014		
Revenues					
Proposition C	\$	496,951 \$	476,926		
Investment income		3,152	3,661		
	Total revenues	500,103	480,587		
Expenditures Various projects T	otal expenditures	1,089,012 1,089,012	50,223 50,223		
Excess (deficiency) of revenues over expe	nditures	(588,909)	430,364		
Fund balance at beginning of year	—	1,691,923	1,261,559		
Fund balance at end of year	\$	1,103,014 \$	1,691,923		

City of San Dimas Proposition C 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 (Nogativo)	2014 Actual
Code	Froject Name	Buuget	Actual		(Negative)	Actual
400-28	Arrow Highway - Lone Hill Signal Modification \$	260,000 \$	256,204	\$	3,796 \$	-
400-29	Lone Hill/Cienega Light Phasing Design	7,950	10,908	*	(2,958)	-
440-24	Pavement Preservation	135,000	133,094		1,906	25,000
440-29	Foothill Blvd Widening at San Dimas Wash	56,105	56,105		-	5,760
440-32	Lone Hill Rehabilitation - Arrow Hwy/Cienega	625,677	625,513		164	8,823
470-01	Pavement Management System	1,500	1,500		-	1,500
480-01	Administration	7,500	5,688		1,812	6,140
500-1	Metro Gold Line JPA Dues	3,000	-		3,000	3,000
	Total expenditures \$	1,096,732 \$	1,089,012	\$	7,720 \$	50,223
	lotal expenditures \$	1,096,732 \$	1,089,012	<u></u> ه	7,720 \$	5

* See Compliance Matrix.

See report of independent auditors.

City of San Dimas 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
12/1/1993	Land	\$ 365,000	\$ -	\$	- \$	365,000
1995/1996	San Dimas Park and Ride Lot	207,688	-		-	207,688
6/29/2005	Street Resurfacting (Infrastructure)	199,829	-		-	199,829
6/30/2006	4 Traffic Camera Systems	20,784	-		-	20,784
4/15/2010	10 Traffic Video Cameras	59,993	-		-	59,993
6/29/2010	San Dimas Ave	802,702	-		-	802,702
6/30/2011	Via Verde Construction/ Puente Covina Hills	-	64,677	*	-	64,677
6/30/2011	Lone Hill /Arrow Light Phasing/ Median	-	339,887	*	-	339,887
6/30/2011	Foothill Blvd Rehabilitation	-	5,760	*	-	5,760
6/30/2013	Lone Hill/ Arrow Hwy/ Cienega	-	639,836	*	-	639,836
6/30/2015	Foothill Blvd San Dimas Wash	-	56,105		-	56,105
	Total	\$ 1,655,996	\$ 1,106,265	\$	- \$	2,762,261

* These capital assets were funded by PCLRF but were not previously included in the Schedule of Capital Assets.

		June 30			
		2015	2014		
	ASSETS				
Cash and investments	\$	939,743	\$ 675,944		
	Total assets \$	939,743	\$ 675,944		
LIABILITIES	AND FUND BALANCE				
Liabilities					
Accounts payable	\$	149,074	\$-		
	Total liabilities	149,074	-		
Fund balance					
Restricted		790,669	675,944		
	Total fund balance	790,669	675,944		
Т	otal liabilities and fund balance \$	939,743	\$ 675,944		
	•				

See notes to financial statements.

		Years ended June 30			
		2015	2014		
Revenues					
Measure R	\$	370,701 \$	353,907		
Investment income		2,142	1,259		
	Total revenues	372,843	355,166		
Expenditures Various projects	Total expenditures	<u>258,118</u> 258,118	<u>154,221</u> 154,221		
Excess of revenues over expenditures		114,725	200,945		
Fund balance at beginning of year		675,944	474,999		
Fund balance at end of year	\$	790,669 \$	675,944		

Project Code	Project Name	LACMTA Budget	Actual	Variance Positive (Negative)	2014 Actual
01-002 01-007	Pavement Preservation Zone G \$ Lone Hill Ave Rehabilitation Arrow/	150,000	\$ 149,075 \$	925 \$	150,000
	Cienega	110,000	105,000	5,000	-
01-008	Via Verde Street Design	45,000	-	45,000	-
08-001	Fund Administration	3,500	4,043	(543)	4,221
	Total expenditures \$	308,500	\$ 258,118 \$	50,382 \$	154,221

Date Acquired		Description			Balance July 1, 2014		Additions	Deletions		Balance June 30, 2015
	None		Total	\$\$		\$_ \$_	- 4		_\$_ _\$_	-

See report of independent auditors.

		June	30
		2015	2014
Cash	ASSETS	\$_	
	Total assets \$	\$_	-
LIABILITIE Liabilities Due to other funds	S AND FUND BALANCE \$ Total liabilities	3,355_\$	<u> </u>
Fund balance			
Restricted		(3,355)	-
	Total fund balance	(3,355)	-
	Total liabilities and fund balance \$	\$_	

		Years ended	June 30
		2015	2014
Revenues Intergovernmental Allocations: Article 3	\$	17,560 \$	19,747
	Ψ Total revenues	<u> </u>	19,747
Expenditures Construction/Maintenance	Total expenditures	<u> 20,915 </u>	<u>19,747</u> 19,747
Deficiency of revenues over expendit	ures	(3,355)	-
Fund balance at beginning of year		<u> </u>	
Fund balance at end of year	\$	(3,355) \$	-

City of San Dimas 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 June 30, 2015

				Totals to Date		
Project Description	Program Year	n 	Allocations	 Expenditures	Unexpended Allocations	Project Status
Local Allocations:						
Reconstruction of Slotted Cross Gutters and Wheelchair Ramps at Various Intersections Totals	2015	\$ \$,	 20,915_\$ 20,915_	<u>(3,355)</u> (3,355)	Ongoing
Fund balance at beginning of year						
Fund balance at end of year				\$	(3,355)	

NOTE 1 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

Fund Accounting

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

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

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

Transportation Development Act Article 3 Fund (TDAA3F) is 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 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT ARTICLE # FUND REVENUE ALLOCATION

The revenue allocation for the years ended June 30, 2015 and 2014 consisted of the following:

	2015	2014
FY 2011/12 reserve	\$ -	\$ 13,813
FY 2012/13 reserve	17,560	5,934
	\$ 17,560	\$ 19,747

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 2012/13 reserve	\$ 2,803	\$ 20,363
FY 2013/14 reserve	27,304	27,304
FY 2014/15 allocation	 22,241	 -
	\$ 52,348	\$ 47,667

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 March 9, 2016, the date the financial statements were available to be issued, and concluded that no events have occurred that require disclosure in 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 San Dimas, 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 San Dimas, 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 March 9, 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.

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.

asynes & Company LLP

Los Angeles, California March 9, 2016

COMPLIANCE SECTION



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

www.vasquezcpa.com

OFFICE LOCATIONS: Los Angeles Sacramento San Diego

Report of Independent Auditors on Compliance

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

Report on Compliance

We have audited the compliance of the City of San Dimas, 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 San Dimas, 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 an instance of noncompliance with the requirements, which is described in the accompanying Compliance Matrix. Our opinion 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 Compliance Matrix. 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 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.

Vacques & Company LLP

Los Angeles, California March 9, 2016

	Compliance Requirements		n liance	Questioned	If no, provide details and	
		Yes	No	Costs	management response.	
Α.	. Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds					
	1. Timely use of funds.	Х		None		
	2. Expenditures approved before					
	being incurred.	Х		None		
	3. Expenditures did not exceed 25%				Finding #2015-001	
	of LACMTA's approved budget.			6		
			Х	\$971	PCLRF	
					The City exceeded LACMTA's approved budget more than 25% without obtaining approval through a revised Project Description Form (Form A) for Project code 400-29, Lone Hill/Cienega Light Phasing Design.	
					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 February 12, 2016.	
					We recommend the City submit a Form A to obtain LACMTA's approval for the change in project budget and for the City to implement control to ensure compliance to this requirement at all times.	

	Compliance Requirements		n liance	Questioned	If no, provide details and	
		Yes No		Costs	management response.	
Α.	Proposition A and Proposition C Local					
	Return Funds (Continued)					
	 Expenditures did not exceed 25% of LACMTA's approved budget. (Continued) 				Management Response The City had an approved budget that was within 25% of the project expenditure but during the fiscal year staff submitted a revised Form A to lower the budget to try and be within 25% below budget. At the time expenditures for the project were low but as we began to receive invoices at the end of the year that had to be accrued back to EX 14-15 the cost	
					back to FY 14-15 the cost went above the new Form A amount. In order to prevent this from happening in the future, towards the end of the fiscal year management staff will do bi-monthly reviews of the account to monitor the fluctuations in the project costs.	
					And all Form A submittals will be reviewed by the Administrative Services Manager to assure that budget changes are known by management and can be tracked and new Form A's can be submitted for approval if need be to stay within 25% and in compliance.	
	4. Administrative expenses are					
	within the 20% cap.	Х		None		
	All on-going and carryover projects were reported in Form B.	Х		None		
	6. Annual Project Summary Report	~	<u> </u>			
	(Form B) was submitted on time.	Х		None		

	Compliance Requirements		n liance	Questioned	If no, provide details and
		Yes	No	Costs	management response.
Α.	Proposition A and Proposition C Local Return Funds (Continued)				
	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.	Measure 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	
	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	Ň			
	R Local Return Account.	Х		None	
	6. Funds were expended with	V		Nama	
	LACMTA's approval.	Х		None	
	7. Expenditure Plan (Form One) was	V		None	
	submitted on time. 8. Expenditure Report (Form Two)	Х		None	
	 Expenditure Report (Form Two) was submitted on time. 	V		None	
		X X		None	
		^		None	
	 Administrative expenses are within the 20% cap. 	Х		None	
	11. Fund exchanges were approved	~		NONE	
	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				
	amenities.	Х		None	

EXIT CONFERENCE

An exit conference was held on March 9, 2016 with City of San Dimas representative. Those in attendance were:

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

City of San Dimas representative: Michael O'Brien – Administrative Services Manager

Matters discussed:

Results of the audit disclosed an issue of noncompliance with the Guidelines.

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

Michael O'Brien – Administrative Services Manager Steven Valdivia – Senior Accounting Technician



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 0, the McGladrey Nilance logo and the McGladrey Alliance signatures are proprietary to RSM US LLP, while RSM™ 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