LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT
ON SCHEDULE OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES
FOR
PROPOSITION A AND PROPOSITION C
SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS

FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2012 (WITH COMPARATIVE TOTALS FOR 2011)

Submitted by

BCA

Bazilio Cobb Associates

21250 Hawthorne Blvd Suite 150 Torrance, CA 90503

PH 310.792.4640 . FX 310.792.5331 . www.baziliocobb.com

Independent Auditor's Report on
Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures
For
Proposition A and Proposition C
Special Revenue Funds

For The Year Ended June 30, 2012 (With Comparative Totals for 2011)

Table of Contents	
	Page
Independent Auditor's Report	1
Proposition A Special Revenue Fund	
Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures	2
Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures - Budget and Actual For the year ended June 30, 2012	3
Proposition C Special Revenue Fund	
Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures	4
Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures - Budget and Actual For the year ended June 30, 2012	5
Notes to Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures for Proposition A and Proposition C Special Revenue Funds	6
Independent Auditor's Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting and on Compliance and Other Matters Based on an Audit of Financial Statements Performed in Accordance with <i>Government Auditing Standards</i>	10
Independent Auditor's Report on Compliance with Requirements Applicable to Proposition A and Proposition C Revenues and Expenditures in Accordance with the MTA Reform and Accountability Act of 1998	12
Schedule of Current Year Findings	14

Certified Public Accountants and Consultants

21250 Hawthorne Blvd.. Suite 150 Torrance, CA 90503 **t:** (310) 792-4640 **f:** (310) 792-4140

Independent Auditor's Report

Independent Citizens' Advisory and Oversight Committee Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

We have audited the accompanying Schedules of Proposition A ("Ordinance No. 16") and Proposition C ("Ordinance No. 49") Revenues and Expenditures (the Schedules) of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) as of and for the year ended June 30, 2012. These Schedules are the responsibility of LACMTA's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these Schedules based on our audit. The prior year's summarized comparative information has been derived from the 2011 Schedules of Proposition A and Proposition C Revenues and Expenditures and, in our report dated November 28, 2011, we expressed an unqualified opinion on those Schedules.

We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the Schedules of Proposition A and Proposition C revenues and expenditures are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the Schedules. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and the significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall Schedule presentation. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, the Schedules referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the Proposition A and Proposition C Revenues and Expenditures of LACMTA as of June 30, 2012, for the year then ended in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

In accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*, we have also issued our report, dated December 5, 2012, on our consideration of LACMTA'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 the internal control over financial reporting or on compliance. That report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* and should be considered in assessing the results of our audit.

Torrance, CA
December 5, 2012

Bazilio Cobb Associates

Proposition A Special Revenue Fund Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures For the year ended June 30, 2012 (With Comparative Totals for 2011)

(Amounts expressed in thousands)

	2012		2011	
Revenues:				
Sales tax	\$	648,692	\$	601,883
Investment income		843		2,246
Net decline in fair value of investments		(82)		(854)
Other revenues		_		41
Total Revenues		649,453		603,316
Expenditures:				
Transportation subsidies		259,569		264,328
Total Expenditures		259,569		264,328
Excess of Revenues over Expenditures		389,884		338,988
Other financing sources (uses)				
Operating transfers in		28,794		-
Operating transfers out		(326,569)		(350,475)
Total other financing sources (uses)		(297,775)		(350,475)
Excess (deficiency) of revenues				
and other financing sources over				
expenditures and other financing uses	\$	92,109	\$	(11,487)

Proposition A Special Revenue Fund Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures – Budget and Actual For the year ended June 30, 2012

(Amounts expressed in thousands)

Budgeted Amounts

	Original		Original		Final		Actual			iance with al Budget
Revenues										
Sales tax	\$	605,100	\$	605,100	\$	648,692	\$	43,592		
Investment income		-		-		843		843		
Net decline in fair value of investments		-		-		(82)		(82)		
Other		-		© -				-		
Total revenues		605,100		605,100		649,453		44,353		
Expenditures										
Transportation subsidies		258,082		258,082		259,569		(1,487)		
Total expenditures		258,082		258,082		259,569		(1,487)		
Excess of revenues over expenditures		347,018		347,018		389,884		42,866		
Other financing sources (uses)										
Transfers in		_		-		28,794		28,794		
Transfers out		(321,408)		(322,317)		(326,569)		(4,252)		
Total other financing sources (uses)		(321,408)		(322,317)		(297,775)		24,542		
Excess (deficiency) of revenues and other financing sources over										
expenditures and other financing uses	\$	25,610	\$	24,701	\$	92,109	\$	67,408		
experiences and outer maneing uses	Ψ	23,010	Ψ_	27,701	Ψ	72,107	Ψ_	07,700		

Proposition C Special Revenue Fund Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures For the year ended June 30, 2012 (With Comparative Totals for 2011)

(Amounts expressed in thousands)

		2012		2011		
Revenues:						
Sales tax	\$	648,776	\$	601,932		
Intergovernmental		210,322		183,085		
Investment income		1,298		3,637		
Net decline in fair value of investments		(145)		(2,735)		
Total Revenues		860,251		785,919		
Expenditures:						
Administration and other		237,755		150,757		
Transportation subsidies		347,767		343,358		
Total Expenditures		585,522		494,115		
Excess of Revenues over Expenditures		274,729		291,804		
Other financing sources (uses)						
Operating transfers in		2,821		2,200		
Operating transfers out	••••	(259,810)		(293,105)		
Total other financing sources (uses)		(256,989)		(290,905)		
Excess (deficiency) of revenues						
and other financing sources over						
expenditures and other financing uses	\$	17,740	\$	899		

Proposition C Special Revenue Fund Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures – Budget and Actual For the year ended June 30, 2012

(Amounts expressed in thousands)

Budgeted Amounts

	Original	Final	Actual	Variance with Final Budget
Revenues				
Sales tax	\$ 605,100	\$ 605,100	\$ 648,776	\$ 43,676
Intergovernmental	197,756	200,015	210,322	10,307
Investment income	-	-	1,298	1,298
Net decline in fair value of investments	8=8	-	(145)	(145)
Total revenues	802,856	805,115	860,251	55,136
Expenditures				
Administration and other	206,471	208,105	237,755	(29,650)
Transportation subsidies	439,655	439,655	347,767	91,888
Total expenditures	646,126	647,760	585,522	62,238
Excess of revenues over expenditures	156,730	157,355	274,729	117,374
Other financing sources (uses)				
Transfers in	5,866	5,866	2,821	(3,045)
Transfers out	(252,330)	(253,791)	(259,810)	(6,019)
Total other financing sources (uses)	(246,464)	(247,925)	(256,989)	(9,064)
Excess (deficiency) of revenues and other financing sources over				
expenditures and other financing uses	\$ (89,734)	\$ (90,570)	\$ 17,740	\$ 108,310

Notes to Schedules of Revenues and Expenditures For Proposition A and Proposition C Special Revenue Funds

June 30, 2012

1. Organization

General

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) is governed by a Board of Directors composed of the five members of the County Board of Supervisors, the Mayor of the City of Los Angeles, three members appointed by the Mayor, and four members who are either mayors or members of a city council and have been appointed by the Los Angeles County City Selection Committee to represent the other cities in the County, and a non-voting member appointed by the Governor of the State of California.

LACMTA is unique among the nation's transportation agencies. It serves as transportation planner and coordinator, designer, builder and operator for one of the country's largest, most populous counties. More than 10 million people – about one fourth of California's residents - live, work, and play within its 1,433-square-mile service area.

Proposition A

The Proposition A Fund is a special revenue fund used to account for the proceeds of the voter-approved one-half percent sales tax that became effective on August 20, 1980. Revenues collected are to be allocated: 25% to be distributed to local jurisdictions for local transit; 35% to be used for construction, debt service payments and operation of rail rapid transit systems; and 40% to be used for public transit purposes at the discretion of LACMTA.

Proposition C

The official name of this special revenue fund is the "Los Angeles Anti-Gridlock Transit Improvement Fund". This fund is used to account for the proceeds of the voter-approved one-half percent sales tax that became effective on August 8, 1990. Revenues collected are to be allocated: 5% to improve and expand rail and bus security; 10% for Commuter Rail and construction of Transit Centers, Park-and-Ride lots and Freeway Bus Stops; 20% to local jurisdictions for public transit and related services; 25% for essential county-wide transit related improvements to freeways and state highways; and 40% to improve and expand rail and bus transit county-wide.

Notes to Schedules of Revenues and Expenditures For Proposition A and Proposition C Special Revenue Funds

June 30, 2012

2. Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

The Schedules of Revenues and Expenditures for Proposition A and Proposition C Special Revenue Funds have been prepared in conformity with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles in the United States of America ("GAAP") as applied to government units. The Governmental Accounting Standards Board ("GASB") is the recognized standard-setting body for establishing governmental accounting and financial reporting principles for governments. The more significant of LACMTA's accounting policies with regard to the special revenue fund type are described below:

Fund Accounting

LACMTA utilizes fund accounting to report its financial position and the results of its operations. Fund accounting is designed to demonstrate legal compliance and to aid financial management by segregating transactions related to certain governmental functions or activities. A fund is a separate accounting entity with a self-balancing set of accounts. Funds are classified into three categories: governmental, proprietary, and fiduciary. Governmental Funds are used to account for most of LACMTA's governmental activities. The measurement focus is a determination of changes in financial position, rather than a net income determination. LACMTA uses governmental fund type Special Revenue Funds to account for Proposition A and Proposition C sales tax revenues and expenditures. Special Revenue Funds are used to account for proceeds of specific revenue sources that are legally restricted to expenditures for specified purposes.

Basis of Accounting

The modified accrual basis of accounting is used for the special revenue fund type. Under the modified accrual basis of accounting, revenues (primarily from sales tax) are recorded when susceptible to accrual, which means measurable (amount can be determined) and available (collectible within the current period or soon enough thereafter to be used to pay liabilities of the current period).

Budgetary Accounting

The established legislation and adopted policies and procedures provide that the LACMTA's Board approves an annual budget. Annual budgets are adopted on a basis consistent with generally accepted accounting principles in the United States of America for all governmental funds.

Notes to Schedules of Revenues and Expenditures For Proposition A and Proposition C Special Revenue Funds

June 30, 2012

2. Summary of Significant Accounting Policies (Continued)

Budgetary Accounting (Continued)

Prior to the adoption of the budget, the Board conducts public hearings for discussion of the proposed annual budget and at the conclusion of the hearings, but not later than June 30, adopts the final budget. All appropriations lapse at fiscal year end. The budget is prepared by fund, project, expense type, and department. The legal level of control is at the fund level and the Board must approve additional appropriations. By policy, the Board has provided procedures for management to make revisions within operational or project budgets only when there is no net dollar impact to the total appropriations at the fund level. Budget amendments are made when needed.

Annual budgets are adopted by LACMTA on the modified accrual basis of accounting for the special revenue fund types, on a basis consistent with GAAP as reflected in the Schedules.

Interest Income and Appreciation (Decline) in Fair Value of Investments

The net appreciation (decline) in the fair value of investments is shown on the Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures. LACMTA maintains a pooled cash and investments account that is available for use by all funds, except those restricted by state statutes.

Use of Estimates

The preparation of the Schedules in conformity with GAAP requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of revenues and expenditures during the reporting period. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

Comparative Financial Data

The amounts shown for 2011 in the accompanying financial statements are included only to provide a basis for comparison with 2012 and are not intended to present all information necessary for a fair presentation in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

Notes to Schedules of Revenues and Expenditures For Proposition A and Proposition C Special Revenue Funds

June 30, 2012

3. Intergovernmental Transactions

Any transaction conducted with a governmental agency outside the complete jurisdiction of LACMTA will be recorded in an account designated as Intergovernmental.

4. Operating Transfers

Amounts reflected as operating transfers represent permanent, legally authorized transfers from a fund receiving revenue to the fund through which the resources are to be expended. All operating transfers in/out of the Proposition A and Proposition C Special Revenue Funds have been made in accordance with all expenditure requirements of both Proposition A and Proposition C Ordinances.



Certified Public Accountants and Consultants

21250 Hawthorne Blvd. Suite 150 Torrance, CA 90503 t: (310) 792-4640 f: (310) 792-4140

Independent Auditor's Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting and on Compliance and Other Matters Based on an Audit of Financial Statements Performed in Accordance with Government Auditing Standards

Independent Citizens' Advisory and Oversight Committee Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

We have audited the accompanying Schedules of Revenues and Expenditures (the Schedules) for Proposition A and Proposition C Special Revenue Funds of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) as of and for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012 and have issued our report thereon dated December 5, 2012. We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States.

Internal Control over Financial Reporting

In planning and performing our audit, we considered the LACMTA's internal control over financial reporting as a basis for designing our auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing our opinion on the Schedules, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the LACMTA's internal control over financial reporting. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the LACMTA's s internal control over financial reporting.

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 combination of deficiencies, in internal control, such that there is a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement of the LACMTA's Schedules will not be prevented, or detected and corrected on a timely basis.

Our consideration of internal control over financial reporting was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and would not necessarily identify all deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that might be deficiencies, significant deficiencies, or material weaknesses. We did not identify any deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that we consider to be material weaknesses, as defined above.

Compliance and Other Matters

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the LACMTA's Schedules are free of material misstatement, we performed tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements, noncompliance with which could have a direct and material effect on the determination of financial statement amounts. However, providing an opinion on compliance with those provisions was not an objective of our audit, and accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. The results of our tests disclosed no instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under *Government Auditing Standards*.

We noted certain matters that we reported to management of the LACMTA in a separate letter dated December 5, 2012.

This report is intended for the information and use of the LACMTA Board of Directors and management, and the Independent Citizens' Advisory and Oversight Committee and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Torrance, California December 5, 2012

Bazilio Cobb Associates

Certified Public Accountants and Consultants

21250 Hawthorne Blvd. Suite 150 Torrance, CA 90503 t: (310) 792-4640 f: (310) 792-4140

Independent Auditor's Report on Compliance with Requirements Applicable to Proposition A and Proposition C Revenues and Expenditures in Accordance with the MTA Reform and Accountability Act of 1998

Independent Citizens' Advisory and Oversight Committee Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Compliance

We have audited the compliance of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) with the types of compliance requirements described in the MTA Reform and Accountability Act of 1998 (the Act), Ordinance No. 16 (Proposition A) and Ordinance No. 49 (Proposition C) that are applicable to Proposition A and Proposition C revenues and expenditures for the year ended June 30, 2012. Compliance with the requirements of the laws, the Act and Ordinances applicable to its Proposition A and Proposition C revenues and expenditures is the responsibility of LACMTA's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on LACMTA's compliance based on our audit.

We conducted our audit of compliance in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether noncompliance with the types of compliance requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on Proposition A and Proposition C revenues and expenditures occurred. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence about LACMTA'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. Our audit does not provide a legal determination on LACMTA's compliance with those requirements.

In our opinion, LACMTA complied, in all material respects, with the requirements referred to above that are applicable to the Proposition A and Proposition C revenues and expenditures for the year ended June 30, 2012.

Internal Control Over Compliance

Management of the LACMTA is responsible for establishing and maintaining effective internal control over compliance with requirements of laws, regulations applicable to the Proposition A and Proposition C revenues and expenditures. In planning and performing our audit, we considered the LACMTA's internal control over compliance requirements that could have a direct and material effect on the Proposition A and Proposition C revenues and expenditures in order to determine our auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing our opinion on compliance and to test and report on internal control over compliance in accordance with the MTA Reform and Accountability Act of 1998, Ordinance No. 16 (Proposition A) and Ordinance No. 49 (Proposition C), 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 LACMTA'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 with a type of compliance requirement on a timely basis. A material weakness in internal control over compliance is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control over compliance, such that there is a reasonable possibility that material noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement will not be prevented, or detected and corrected, on a timely basis.

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 deficiencies, significant deficiencies, or material weaknesses. We did not identify any deficiencies in internal control over compliance that we consider to be material weaknesses, as defined above.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the LACMTA's Board of Directors and management, and the Independent Citizens' Advisory and Oversight Committee, and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Torrance, California December 5, 2012

Bazilio Cobb Associates

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Schedule of Current Year Findings

For the Year Ended June 30, 2012

None noted.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation AuthorityStatus of Prior Year Findings

For the Year Ended June 30, 2012

None noted.