



Crowe LLP
Independent Member Crowe Global

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON
APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES
CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH

Board of Directors
Orange County Local Transportation Authority and
the Taxpayers Oversight Committee of the
Orange County Local Transportation Authority
Orange, California

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, which were agreed to by the Taxpayers Oversight Committee of the Orange County Local Transportation Authority (OCLTA) (the specified party), related to the City of Huntington Beach's (City) compliance with certain provisions of the Measure M2 Local Transportation Ordinance (Ordinance) as of and for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2024. The City's management is responsible for compliance with the Ordinance and for its cash, revenue, and expenditure records.

The Taxpayers Oversight Committee of the OCLTA has agreed to and acknowledged that the procedures performed are appropriate to meet the intended purpose of evaluating the City's compliance with certain provisions of the Ordinance as of and for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2024. We make no representation regarding the appropriateness of the procedures either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose. This report may not be suitable for any other purpose. The procedures performed may not address all the items of interest to a user of this report and may not meet the needs of all users of this report and, as such, users are responsible for determining whether the procedures performed are appropriate for their purposes. An agreed-upon procedures engagement involves performing specific procedures that the engaging party has agreed to and acknowledged to be appropriate for the intended purpose of the engagement and reporting on findings based on the procedures performed.

The procedures and associated findings were as follows:

1. Describe which funds the Eligible Jurisdiction used to track all street and road expenditures and inquire how the Eligible Jurisdiction identifies (Maintenance of Effort) MOE expenditures in its general ledger.

Findings: The MOE expenditures were tracked in the City's general ledger by fund, object, and business unit number. The City recorded its MOE expenditures in its General Fund (100) and Capital Projects Fund (314). Expenditures are identified by a 5-digit object number and a 5-digit business unit number. No exceptions were found as a result of this procedure.

2. Obtain the detail of MOE expenditures for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2024 and determine whether the Eligible Jurisdiction met the minimum MOE requirement as outlined in the Measure M2 Eligibility Guidelines Fiscal Year 2023/2024. Agree the total MOE expenditures to the amount reported on the Eligible Jurisdiction's Expenditure Report (Schedule 3, line 18). Explain any differences.

(Continued)

Findings: The City's MOE expenditures per the general ledger for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2024, were \$22,360,255 (see Schedule A), which exceeded the MOE benchmark requirement of \$6,494,379. We agreed the total expenditures of \$22,360,255 to the amount reported on the City's Expenditure Report (Schedule 3, line 18). No exceptions were found as a result of this procedure.

3. Select a sample of MOE expenditures from the Eligible Jurisdiction's general ledger expenditure detail. Describe the percentage of total expenditures selected for inspection. For each item selected, perform the following:
 - a. Agree the dollar amount listed on the general ledger to supporting documentation, which may include a check copy or wire transfer, vendor invoice, payroll registers and timecards, journal voucher or other appropriate supporting documentation; and
 - b. Determine whether the expenditure was properly classified as a local street and road expenditure and is allowable per the Ordinance.

Findings: We selected 25 direct MOE expenditures totaling \$5,188,886, which represented approximately 31% of direct MOE expenditures of \$16,508,272 for fiscal year ended June 30, 2024. We agreed the dollar amount listed on the general ledger to supporting documentation provided by the City. We determined that the expenditures were properly classified as local street and road expenditures and are allowable per the Ordinance, except for \$4,456,129 reported as direct charges that should have been reported as indirect costs. See Procedure #4 for indirect cost testing. No other exceptions were found as a result of this procedure.

4. Identify whether indirect costs were charged as MOE expenditures. If applicable, compare indirect costs identified to the amount reported on the Eligible Jurisdiction's Expenditure Report (Schedule 3, line 1). Explain any differences. If applicable, obtain detail of indirect costs charged, and select a sample of charges for inspection. Inspect supporting documentation for reasonableness and appropriate methodology.

Findings: We agreed total indirect expenditures of \$5,851,983 per the general ledger to the amount reported on the City's Expenditure Report (Schedule 3, line 1) with no differences. We selected 35 charges for inspection with a total amount of \$1,629,278 representing 28% of the total MOE indirect costs of \$5,851,983. During testing of direct costs at Procedure #3, we identified an additional \$4,456,129 in indirect costs that were reported as direct costs. These expenditures included allocations of payroll and benefits, insurance costs, contracted services, information technology software, monthly print shop/mail/phone, equipment rentals, and various other charges. For indirect costs, the methodology used to allocate costs should be documented and represent a fair and reasonable allocation of costs. The City was unable to provide a documented methodology representing a fair and reasonable allocation of costs. As such, these expenditures were deemed unallowable and removed from the MOE benchmark calculation. Also, we identified six charges totaling \$78,490 that should have been identified as direct costs as they were charged 100% to MOE projects. After removing unsupported indirect cost allocations, totaling \$10,229,622, the City still met the MOE benchmark. No other exceptions were found as a result of this procedure.

5. Obtain a listing of Measure M2 Local Fair Share payments made from OCLTA to the Eligible Jurisdiction and calculate the amount the Eligible Jurisdiction received for the past three fiscal years. Obtain the fund balance of the Eligible Jurisdiction's Measure M2 Local Fair Share Fund as of June 30, 2024 and agree to the balance as listed on the Eligible Jurisdiction's Expenditure Report (Schedule 1, line 20) and determine whether funds were expended within three years of receipt or within five years, if an extension was granted. Explain any differences.

Findings: The City received \$13,436,734 for the past three fiscal years ended June 30, 2022, 2023, and 2024. We agreed the fund balance of \$5,115,802 from the general ledger detail to the City's Expenditure Report (Schedule 1, line 20), with no differences. We determined funds were expended within three years of receipt. No exceptions were found as a result of this procedure.

(Continued)

6. Describe which fund the Eligible Jurisdiction used to track expenditures relating to Measure M2 Local Fair Share monies in its general ledger and the amount spent during the fiscal year ended June 30, 2024. Agree the total Local Fair Share expenditures per the general ledger to the amounts reflected on the Eligible Jurisdiction's Expenditure Report (Schedule 2, line 17, and detail listed at Schedule 4). Explain any differences.

Findings: The City tracks its LFS expenditures in its Measure M2 Fair Share Fund (213). Total Measure M2 Local Fair Share expenditures per the general ledger during the fiscal year ended June 30, 2024, were \$3,506,656 (see Schedule A), which agreed to the amount reported in the City's Expenditure Report (Schedule 2, line 17, and detail listed at Schedule 4). No exceptions were found as a result of this procedure.

7. Obtain the Eligible Jurisdiction's Seven-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP). Compare the projects listed on the Eligible Jurisdiction's Expenditure Report (Schedule 4) to the Seven-Year CIP, explaining any differences. Select a sample of Measure M2 Local Fair Share expenditures from the Eligible Jurisdiction's general ledger expenditure detail. Describe the percentage of total expenditures selected for inspection. For each item selected perform the following:
 - a. Agree the dollar amount listed on the general ledger to supporting documentation, which may include a check copy or wire transfer, vendor invoice, payroll registers and timecards, journal vouchers or other appropriate supporting documentation; and
 - b. Determine that the expenditures selected in (a) above were related to projects included in the Eligible Jurisdiction's Seven-Year CIP and are properly classified as Measure M2 Local Fair Share projects.

Findings: Eligible Jurisdictions should identify specific projects by their actual titles as well as a brief description for all projects that utilized any portion of Measure M2 Local Fair Share Funding in the City's Expenditure Report (Schedule 4). When comparing the projects listed on the City's Expenditure Report (Schedule 4) to the Seven-Year CIP, we found that the City had included only generic project titles such as "General Street Maintenance", "Residential Pavement", "Pedestrian Improvement" and "Arterial Rehabilitation" on their Schedule 4, rather than specific projects that could be traced to their Seven-Year CIP. We selected 25 direct Measure M2 Local Fair Share expenditures for inspection totaling \$2,047,698 representing approximately 58% of total direct Measure M2 Local Fair Share expenditures of \$3,505,190 for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 2024. We agreed the dollar amount to supporting documentation and determined that expenditures were properly classified and allowable per the Ordinance, except for payroll charges of \$29,249 for one employee. Discussion with the City indicated that the payroll system was erroneously set up to charge this employee's holiday, general, and administrative leave time to a General Street Maintenance Project funded by Local Fair Share. The employee in question does not perform street maintenance work. As such, these charges are deemed unallowable per the Ordinance. No other exceptions were found as a result of this procedure.

8. Identify whether indirect costs were charged as Measure M2 Local Fair Share expenditures. If applicable, compare indirect costs identified to the amount reported on the Eligible Jurisdiction's Expenditure Report (Schedule 3, line 1). Explain any differences. If applicable, select a sample of charges. Describe the dollar amount inspected. Identify the amounts charged and inspect supporting documentation for reasonableness and appropriate methodology.

Findings: Based upon inspection of the Expenditure Report (Schedule 3, line 1), the City reported \$1,466 in indirect costs for LFS for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2024. We selected 10 Local Fair Share indirect costs for inspection totaling \$1,466 representing 100% of the total Local Fair Share indirect costs. Upon inspection, we found these charges were for membership dues for public works associations and charges for public works conferences that were charged directly to Local Fair Share projects. As such, these costs should have been reported as direct costs. No other exceptions were found as a result of this procedure.

9. Obtain and inspect the Eligible Jurisdiction's interest allocation methodology and amount of interest allocated to the Measure M2 Local Fair Share Fund to ensure the proper amount of interest was credited. Agree the amount reflected to the amount of interest listed on the Eligible Jurisdiction's Expenditure Report (Schedule 2, line 4). Explain any differences.

Findings: We inspected the amount of interest allocated to the Measure M2 Local Fair Share Fund and agreed the amount reflected to the amount of interest totaling \$112,603 listed on the City's Expenditure Report (Schedule 2, line 4). We inspected the interest allocation methodology and recomputed the amount based on the interest allocation methodology. No exceptions were found as a result of this procedure.

10. Determine whether the Jurisdiction was found eligible by the Board of Directors for the applicable year (FY24) by inspecting the OCLTA Board agenda and action items.

Findings: No exceptions were found as a result of this procedure.

We were engaged by OCLTA to perform this agreed-upon procedures engagement and conducted our engagement in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. We were not engaged to and did not conduct an examination or review engagement, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion or conclusion, respectively, on the accounting records, any indirect cost allocation plans and compliance with the provisions of the Measure M2 Local Transportation Ordinance. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion or conclusion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

We are required to be independent of the City's management and to meet our other ethical responsibilities, in accordance with the relevant ethical requirements related to our agreed-upon procedures engagement.

At the request of OCLTA, the City's responses to certain findings are included in Exhibit 1. The responses are included for the purpose of additional information and were not subjected to the procedures described above. Accordingly, we did not perform any procedures on the City's responses and express no assurance or opinion on them.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of and is not intended to be, and should not be, used by anyone other than the specified party.



Crowe LLP

Costa Mesa, California
April 9, 2025

CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH, CALIFORNIA
SCHEDULE OF MEASURE M2 LOCAL FAIR SHARE EXPENDITURES
Year ended June 30, 2024
(Unaudited)

| | SCHEDULE A |
|---|----------------------|
| Maintenance of Effort (MOE) Expenditures: | |
| Indirect and/ or Overhead - Schedule 3, line 1 | \$ 5,851,983 |
| Construction & Right-of-Way | |
| Street Reconstruction | \$ 1,465,541 |
| Total Construction | <u>\$ 1,465,541</u> |
| Maintenance | |
| Patching | \$ 443,143 |
| Overlay & Sealing | 6,687,899 |
| Street Lights & Traffic Signals | 1,368,750 |
| Other Street Purpose Maintenance | 6,542,940 |
| Total Maintenance | <u>\$ 15,042,732</u> |
| Total MOE Expenditures | <u>\$ 22,360,255</u> |
| Measure M2 Local Fair Share Expenditures (Schedule 4): | |
| General Street Maintenance | \$ 1,747,757 |
| Residential Pavement | 259,695 |
| Pedestrian Improvement | 191,593 |
| Arterial Rehabilitation | 1,307,611 |
| Total Measure M2 Local Fair Share Expenditures | <u>\$ 3,506,656</u> |
| Total MOE and Measure M2 Local Fair Share Expenditures | <u>\$ 25,866,912</u> |

Note: The above amounts were taken directly from the financial records of the City of Huntington Beach and were not audited.



CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH

Exhibit 1

Robert Torrez | *Interim Chief Financial Officer*

April 9, 2025

Board of Directors
Orange County Local Transportation Authority
and the Taxpayers Oversight Committee of the
Orange County Local Transportation Authority
Orange, California

The following response is being submitted to address results from the agreed upon procedures performed for the Measure M2 Local Fair Share program for the City of Huntington Beach as of and for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2024.

Procedure #3

Select a sample of MOE expenditures from the Eligible Jurisdiction's general ledger expenditure detail. Describe the percentage of total expenditures selected for inspection. For each item selected, perform the following:

- a. Agree the dollar amount listed on the general ledger to supporting documentation, which may include a check copy or wire transfer, vendor invoice, payroll registers and timecards, journal voucher or other appropriate supporting documentation; and
- b. Determine whether the expenditure was properly classified as a local street and road expenditure and is allowable per the Ordinance.

Findings: We selected 25 direct MOE expenditures totaling \$5,188,886, which represented approximately 31% of direct MOE expenditures of \$16,508,272 for fiscal year ended June 30, 2024. We agreed the dollar amount listed on the general ledger to supporting documentation provided by the City. We determined that the expenditures were properly classified as local street and road expenditures and are allowable per the Ordinance, except for \$4,456,129 reported as direct charges that should have been reported as indirect costs. See Procedure #4 for indirect cost testing. No other exceptions were found as a result of this procedure.

City's Response: The City will evaluate its financial reporting methods and adopt measures to ensure that Maintenance of Effort expenditures are properly categorized in future reports.

Procedure #4

Identify whether indirect costs were charged as MOE expenditures. If applicable, compare indirect costs identified to the amount reported on the Eligible Jurisdiction's Expenditure Report (Schedule 3, line 1). Explain any differences. If applicable, obtain detail of indirect costs charged, and select a sample of charges for inspection. Inspect supporting documentation for reasonableness and appropriate methodology.

Findings: We agreed total indirect expenditures of \$5,851,983 per the general ledger to the amount reported on the City's Expenditure Report (Schedule 3, line 1) with no differences. We selected 35

charges for inspection with a total amount of \$1,629,278 representing 28% of the total MOE indirect costs of \$5,851,983. During testing of direct costs at Procedure #3, we identified an additional \$4,456,129 in indirect costs that were reported as direct costs. These expenditures included allocations of payroll and benefits, insurance costs, contracted services, information technology software, monthly print shop/mail/phone, equipment rentals, and various other charges. For indirect costs, the methodology used to allocate costs should be documented and represent a fair and reasonable allocation of costs. The City was unable to provide a documented methodology representing a fair and reasonable allocation of costs. As such, these expenditures were deemed unallowable and removed from the MOE benchmark calculation. Also, we identified six charges totaling \$78,490 that should have been identified as direct costs as they were charged 100% to MOE projects. After removing unsupported indirect cost allocations, totaling \$10,229,622, the City still met the MOE benchmark. No other exceptions were found as a result of this procedure.

City's Response: The City will review its financial reporting processes methodology used to allocate Maintenance of Effort costs and implement procedures to ensure that expenditures are correctly classified in future reports.

Procedure #7

Obtain the Eligible Jurisdiction's Seven-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP). Compare the projects listed on the Eligible Jurisdiction's Expenditure Report (Schedule 4) to the Seven-Year CIP, explaining any differences. Select a sample of Measure M2 Local Fair Share expenditures from the Eligible Jurisdiction's general ledger expenditure detail. Describe the percentage of total expenditures selected for inspection. For each item selected perform the following:

- a. Agree the dollar amount listed on the general ledger to supporting documentation, which may include a check copy or wire transfer, vendor invoice, payroll registers and timecards, journal vouchers or other appropriate supporting documentation; and
- b. Determine that the expenditures selected in (a) above were related to projects included in the Eligible Jurisdiction's Seven-Year CIP and are properly classified as Measure M2 Local Fair Share projects.

Findings: Eligible Jurisdictions should identify specific projects by their actual titles as well as a brief description for all projects that utilized any portion of Measure M2 Local Fair Share Funding in the City's Expenditure Report (Schedule 4). When comparing the projects listed on the City's Expenditure Report (Schedule 4) to the Seven-Year CIP, we found that the City had included only generic project titles such as "General Street Maintenance", "Residential Pavement", "Pedestrian Improvement" and "Arterial Rehabilitation" on their Schedule 4, rather than specific projects that could be traced to their Seven-Year CIP. We selected 25 direct Measure M2 Local Fair Share expenditures for inspection totaling \$2,047,698 representing approximately 58% of total direct Measure M2 Local Fair Share expenditures of \$3,505,190 for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 2024. We agreed the dollar amount to supporting documentation and determined that expenditures were properly classified and allowable per the Ordinance, except for payroll charges of \$29,249 for one employee. Discussion with the City indicated that the payroll system was erroneously set up to charge this employee's holiday, general, and administrative leave time to a General Street Maintenance Project funded by Local Fair Share. The employee in question does not perform street maintenance work. As such, these charges are deemed unallowable per the Ordinance. No other exceptions were found as a result of this procedure.

City's Response: The City will undertake a comprehensive review of its financial reporting protocols and establish enhanced internal controls to ensure the accurate classification of Local Fair Share

expenditures in all subsequent financial reports. A journal entry in the amount of \$29,249 has been completed to refund the erroneously charged Local Fair Share funds.

Procedure #8

Identify whether indirect costs were charged as Measure M2 Local Fair Share expenditures. If applicable, compare indirect costs identified to the amount reported on the Eligible Jurisdiction's Expenditure Report (Schedule 3, line 1). Explain any differences. If applicable, select a sample of charges. Describe the dollar amount inspected. Identify the amounts charged and inspect supporting documentation for reasonableness and appropriate methodology.

Findings: Based upon inspection of the Expenditure Report (Schedule 3, line 1), the City reported \$1,466 in indirect costs for LFS for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2024. We selected 10 Local Fair Share indirect costs for inspection totaling \$1,466 representing 100% of the total Local Fair Share indirect costs. Upon inspection, we found these charges were for membership dues for public works associations and charges for public works conferences that were charged directly to Local Fair Share projects. As such, these costs should have been reported as direct costs. No other exceptions were found as a result of this procedure.

City's Response: The City will review its financial reporting processes and implement procedures to ensure that Local Fair Share expenditures are correctly classified in future reports.


Travis Hopkins, City Manager


Robert Torrez, Chief Financial Officer


Chau Vu, Director of Public Works