Imperial County Transportation Commission & First Transit, Inc.

Imperial Valley Transit Service Report

For the Year Ended June 30, 2015

INDE	PENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT	3 - 4
ACCC	DUNTANTS' COMMENTS	5 - 6
SUPP	PLEMENTAL INFORMATION	
	Exhibit A – Internal Controls over Cash Handling Procedures	7
	Exhibit B – Transit Vehicles in Custody of Service Provider	8
	Exhibit C – Statement of Fixed Rate, Farebox Revenue and Net Subsidy – El Centro Shuttle – Blue Line Service	9
	Exhibit D – Statement of Fixed Rate, Farebox Revenue and Net Subsidy – El Centro Shuttle- Green Line Service	10
	Exhibit E – Statement of Fixed Rate, Farebox Revenue and Net Subsidy – El Centro Shuttle- (Blue and Green Line) Services	11
	Exhibit F – Statement of Fixed Rate, Farebox Revenue and Net Subsidy – Brawley Shuttle- Gold Line Services	12
	Exhibit G – Statement of Fixed Rate, Farebox Revenue and Net Subsidy – Countywide Service Line	13
	Exhibit H – Statement of Fixed Rate, Farebox Revenue and Net Subsidy – All First Transit Services Combined	14



3205 South Dogwood Avenue El Centro, CA 92243 t 760.352.1021 f 760.352.3325 www.hbllp.com

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT

Imperial County Transportation Commission 1405 N. Imperial Avenue Suite 1 El Centro, California

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, which were agreed to by the Imperial County Transportation Commission's Management, solely to assist the specified party in evaluating the specific First Transit, Inc. transit services contract items for the year ended June 30, 2015. This agreed-upon procedures engagement was conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. The sufficiency of these procedures is solely the responsibility of those specified parties in this report. Consequently, we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the procedures described below either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose.

Our procedures and findings are as follows:

- 1. We reviewed the transit service contract, including contract modifications, between the Imperial County Transportation Commission and First Transit, Inc. for the provisions of specific transit services to be provided.
- 2. We reviewed documents provided by the Imperial County Transportation Commission and First Transit, Inc. to verify that expenditure and fare amounts reported to the Imperial County Transportation Commission Administration for the specific transit services were presented fairly and accurately. We found that First Transit, Inc. is in compliance with the contract terms and reporting properly as agreed per contract(s). See Exhibits C through H as references for this review.
- 3. We reviewed on a test basis fuel expenditures reported for all specific transit services provided and noted if these expenditures were in accordance to the fuel related terms included in the service contract. We found that First Transit, Inc. is in compliance with the contract terms and these expenditures are within budget and reported accordingly.
- 4. We reviewed First Transit's internal controls over cash handling procedures and tested their fare collection process and related activities. We found that the internal controls set by First Transit, Inc. are adequate based on established guidelines. See Exhibit A as reference for this review.
- 5. We reviewed that transit vehicles owned by the Imperial County Transportation Commission are utilized as part of the transit service assigned for, are maintained in a secure location and are serviced accordingly by First Transit, Inc. See Exhibit B as reference for this review.

We were not engaged to, and did not, conduct an audit, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on the accounting records. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the management, the Imperial County Transportation Commission, the County of Imperial Board of Supervisors and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Hutchnison and Bloodgood LLP

February 17, 2016

IMPERIAL COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION AND FIRST TRANSIT, INC. IMPERIAL VALLEY TRANSIT SERVICE PROGRAM FOR YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2015

ACCOUNTANTS' COMMENTS

PURPOSE

The purpose of this engagement pertaining to the service contract between the Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC) and First Transit, Inc. was to provide an independent assessment of compliance with certain contract requirements during the period July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015, to assess the adequacy of First Transit Inc.'s internal controls over cash handling and reporting procedures and document the performance of our observation of the transit vehicles owned by ICTC under the custody of First Transit, Inc.

FARE REVENUES

The service contract for each of the services provided by First Transit, Inc. states that the farebox ratio of fare revenue divided by operating costs shall be maintained at or above seventeen percent (17.0%) for the Imperial Valley Transit service line, five percent (5.0%) for the El Centro Shuttle (Blue and Green Line) and four percent (4.0%) for the Brawley Shuttle (Gold Line).

For the El Centro Shuttle (Blue and Green Line) the actual farebox recovery ratio was over four percent (4.2%); (\$26,312 fare revenue divided by \$619,876 operating costs). See Exhibit E.

For the Brawley Shuttle (Gold Line) the actual farebox recovery ratio was over four percent (4.1%); (\$10,426 fare revenue divided by \$253,874 operating costs). See Exhibit F.

For the Imperial Valley Transit service line the actual farebox recovery ratio was over twenty-six percent (26.3%); (\$711,302 fare revenue divided by \$2,701,779 adjusted operating costs). See Exhibit G.

The letter from the California Department of Transportation dated May 9, 2013 states that the suggested blended farebox recovery ratio calculation for the transit services above was approved and the blended farebox recovery ratio was set at seventeen percent (17.0%).

For fiscal year ended June 30, 2015 the actual blended farebox ratio for all transit services combined was of over twenty percent (20.9%); (\$748,041 fare revenue divided by \$3,575,528 adjusted operating costs). See Exhibit H.

ICTC SUBSIDY

The contract's sixth modification, dated June 25, 2013, states that the compensation for the Imperial Valley Transit Line for the period of July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015 is identified as \$3,131,869 less the farebox of 17% for a net subsidy not to exceed \$2,599,451, with a marketing budget of \$156,593. Actual costs for the year reported to ICTC were \$2,459,263 in operational expense, \$6,294 in additional fuel expenses, and \$41,412 in marketing expenses for a combined total of \$2,506,969. See Exhibit G.

For the El Centro Shuttle service line, which includes the Blue and Green Lines, the compensation is identified as \$663,808 less the farebox of 5.0% for a net subsidy not to exceed \$630,618, with a marketing budget of \$33,190. Actual costs for the year reported to ICTC were \$590,221 in operational expense, \$333 in additional fuel expenses, and \$3,009 in marketing expenses for a combined total of \$593,563. See Exhibit E.

For the Brawley Shuttle service line, which is known as the Gold Line, the compensation is identified as \$252,437 less the farebox of 4.0% for a net subsidy not to exceed \$242,340, with an adjusted marketing budget of \$12,622. Actual costs for the year reported to ICTC were \$242,308 in operational expense, \$146 in additional fuel expenses, and \$994 in marketing expenses for a combined total of \$243,447. See Exhibit F.

EXHIBIT A

IMPERIAL COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION AND FIRST TRANSIT, INC. IMPERIAL VALLEY TRANSIT SERVICE PROGRAM INTERNAL CONTROLS OVER CASH HANDLING PROCEDURES FOR YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2015

OBJECTIVE

Review established internal control procedures over cash handling and perform a walkthrough observation of the fare collection cycle and related processes.

PROCEDURES

Reviewed First Transit, Inc. established guidelines over cash handling. Interviewed management and staff associated with the fare collection cycle. Observed cash count of total fares contained in farebox and confirmed amount collected with amount counted and amount reported.

OBSERVATIONS

It was noted that empty fareboxes are placed inside the transit vehicle under dual custody. Drivers observe that boarding passengers place money inside the farebox and keep a log of boarding passengers separated by fare type. At the end of the day, each full farebox is removed, also under dual custody, and locked inside the vault. All cash fares are counted the following day by two staff members in a locked room. Once cash is counted it is placed in sealed deposit bags and kept under key until ready to be deposited at the bank. If foreign currency is detected, it is separated, exchanged once a significant amount is collected and allocated among all transit services.

During the performance of this review it was noted that variances are generated when comparing the number of passengers to the projected fare they are required to pay. Some passengers do not have the correct fare and this results in most of them paying more than the required fare. Frequently it results in positive fare variances since the passengers that overpay is larger than those that underpay. It is recommended to perform a cost benefit analysis of upgrading fareboxes to those that can make change, accept only U.S. currency and are able to accept other forms of payment. Actual fares and not projected fares are those fares reported to the ICTC as fares received.

CONCLUSION

We found that the internal controls set by First Transit, Inc. are adequate based on established guidelines and that actual fares received are properly reported to the ICTC.

EXHIBIT B

IMPERIAL COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION AND FIRST TRANSIT, INC. IMPERIAL VALLEY TRANSIT SERVICE PROGRAM TRANSIT VEHICLES IN CUSTODY OF SERVICE PROVIDER FOR YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2015

OBJECTIVE

Review that transit vehicles property of the Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC) are used for the contracted IVT transit service as well as are maintained in a secure location when not in service, and are being serviced as scheduled.

PROCEDURES

Perform a site visit of the First Transit, Inc. Bus and Maintenance Yard located at 792 East Ross Road in the City of El Centro. Observed and evaluated the condition of every ICTC owned vehicle based on vehicle list provided by ICTC.

OBSERVATIONS

When not in operation the transit vehicles are maintained inside the fenced and gated bus yard. There is only one entrance and exit point and the gate is locked once all vehicles are in. There are several outdoor lights that light up the parked vehicles and around the Maintenance Shop. The Maintenance Shop has cameras inside as well as an alarm system that is activated by the last person to leave the Bus Yard and deactivated by the morning dispatcher. There were no cameras noted in the Bus Yard area. Each transit vehicle is equipped with several cameras outside and inside the vehicle and activated when in service.

Each transit vehicle was observed prior to the start of the service day. Each vehicle number and description was compared to the vehicle list provided by ICTC. Each vehicle was inspected inside and outside for any visible damage, farebox placement, and overall working condition. Of the sixteen transit vehicles used for the IVT-Transit service, one was inside the Maintenance Shop for the scheduled service and another one is out of service waiting for the transmission to be repaired. No other issues were noted with the remaining fourteen transit vehicles.

Service files for each transit vehicle are maintained in an office inside the Maintenance Shop under the custody of the Maintenance Manager. They contain records of all maintenance and services performed to each transit vehicle.

CONCLUSION

It appears that First Transit, Inc. is properly maintaining the ICTC owned vehicles in a secure location and servicing them as scheduled or as required.

El Centro Shuttle - Blue Line Service

Date	Base Cost	Farebox	Net Subsidy	Fuel Escalator	Marketing	Net Cost and Total Paid to First Transit
July, 2014 August, 2014 September, 2014 October, 2014 November, 2014 December, 2014 January, 2015 February, 2015 March, 2015 May, 2015 June, 2015	 \$ 25,699 24,847 24,851 27,652 23,387 26,785 25,100 24,262 26,797 26,822 25,125 26,821 	 \$ 1,072 2,482 1,834 1,926 1,535 825 891 1,342 931 881 495 1,999 	 \$ 24,626 22,365 23,017 25,726 21,853 25,960 24,210 22,920 25,866 25,941 24,630 24,822 	\$ 167 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	\$ - 640 460 - - 20 - - 640 250 - -	\$ 24,793 23,005 23,477 25,726 21,853 25,980 24,210 22,920 26,506 26,191 24,630 24,822
Total	\$ 308,150	\$ 16,214	\$ 291,936	\$ 167	\$ 2,009	\$ 294,112
Contract Specifications Paragraph 8.1.2.4 For Base Cost and Base Subsidy	\$ 331,904	\$ 16,595	\$ 315,309			
Over (Under) Contract Requirements	\$ (23,754)	\$ (382)	\$ (23,373)			
Farebox Ratio Actual		5.2%				
Farebox Ratio Contract		5.0%				

	El Centro Shuttle-Green Line Service									
Date	Base Cost	Farebox	Net Subsidy	Fuel Escalator	Marketing	Net Cost and Total Paid to First Transit				
hube 2014		ć 1.000	ć <u>24 C12</u>	\$ 166	\$-	\$ 24,780				
July, 2014	\$ 25,705 24,862	\$ 1,092 747	\$ 24,613 24,116	Ş 100	Ş -					
August, 2014 September, 2014	24,862 24,842	747 701	24,116 24,141	-	- 460	24,116 24,601				
•		701		-	400	-				
October, 2014 November, 2014	27,676 23,413	790 662	26,885 22,751	-	-	26,885				
December, 2014		858	22,751 25,954	-	- 23	22,751				
	26,812	858 777	25,954 24,352	-	23	25,976 24,352				
January, 2015 February, 2015	25,129	1,061	24,552 23,227	-	-	24,552 23,227				
March, 2015	24,288 26,819	857	25,227	-	- 267	26,229				
April, 2015	26,819	809	25,962 26,036	-	267	26,229				
May, 2015	20,840	667	20,030 24,490	-	230	20,280				
	-		-	-	-	-				
June, 2015	26,834	1,076	25,758	-	-	25,758				
Total	\$ 308,384	\$ 10,099	\$ 298,285	\$ 166	\$ 999	\$ 299,451				
Contract Specifications Paragraph 8.1.2.4 For Base Cost	i									
and Base Subsidy	\$ 331,904	\$ 16,595	\$ 315,309							
	+	+ =0,000	+ 010,000							
Over (Under) Contract										
Requirements	\$ (23,520)	\$ (6,496)	\$ (17,024)							
Farebox Ratio Actual		3.3%								
Farebox Ratio Contract	:	5.0%								

	El Centro Shuttle (Blue and Green Line) Services								
Date	Base Cost	Farebox	Net Subsidy	Fuel Escalator	Marketing	Net Cost and Total Paid to First Transit			
July, 2014	\$ 51,404	\$ 2,165	\$ 49,240	\$ 333	\$-	\$ 49,573			
August, 2014	49,709	3,228	46,481	-	640	47,121			
September, 2014	49,692	2,535	47,158	-	920	48,078			
October, 2014	55,328	2,716	52,612	-	-	52,612			
November, 2014	46,800	2,197	44,604	-	-	44,604			
December, 2014	53 <i>,</i> 597	1,684	51,914	-	43	51,956			
January, 2015	50,230	1,668	48,561	-	-	48,561			
February, 2015	48,551	2,403	46,147	-	-	46,147			
March, 2015	53,616	1,788	51,828	-	906	52,734			
April, 2015	53,668	1,691	51,978	-	500	52,478			
May, 2015	50,282	1,162	49,120	-	-	49,120			
June, 2015	53,655	3,075	50,580	-	-	50,580			
Total	\$ 616,534	\$ 26,312	\$ 590,221	\$ 333	\$ 3,009	\$ 593,563			
Contract Specification	S								
Paragraph 8.1.2.4									
For Base Cost									
and Base Subsidy	\$ 663,808	\$ 33,190	\$ 630,618						
Over (Under) Contract	t								
Requirements	\$ (47,274)	\$ (6,878)	\$ (40,396)						
	<u> </u>								
Farebox Ratio Actual		4.2%							
Farebox Ratio Contrac	t	5.0%							

	Brawley Shuttle - Gold Line Service											
Date	Base Cost		Net Farebox Subsidy		Fuel Escalator Marl		Total Pa		t Cost and tal Paid to st Transit			
				~~~								
July, 2014	\$	22,185	\$	807	\$	21,378	\$	146	\$	-	\$	21,523
August, 2014		21,301		761		20,540		-		-		20,540
September, 2014		21,305		872		20,433		-		460		20,893
October, 2014		22,866		941		21,925		-		-		21,925
November, 2014		18,466		887		17,579		-		-		17,579
December, 2014		21,990		712		21,278		-		25		21,302
January, 2015		20,228		720		19,508		-		-		19,508
February, 2015		19,356		780		18,576		-		-		18,576
March, 2015		22,015		1,440		20,575		-		259		20,835
April, 2015		22,000		786		21,214		-		250		21,464
May, 2015		20,228		807		19,421		-		-		19,421
June, 2015		20,793		913		19,880		-		-		19,880
Total	\$	252,734	\$	10,426	\$2	242,308	\$	146	\$	994	\$	243,447
Contract Specifications Paragraph 8.1.3.2 For Base Cost	5											
and Base Subsidy	Ś	252,437	Ś	10,097	\$ 2	242,339						
Over (Under) Contract	<u> </u>											
Requirements	\$	297	\$	329	\$	(31)						
Farebox Ratio Actual	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	4.1%		(31)						
Farebox Ratio Contract	t			4.0%								

	Imperial Valley Transit - Countywide Service Line								
Date	Date Base Cost		Net Subsidy	Fuel Escalator	Marketing	Net Cost and Total Paid to First Transit			
July, 2014 August, 2014 September, 2014 October, 2014 November, 2014 December, 2014 January, 2015 February, 2015 March, 2015 May, 2015	<ul> <li>\$ 299,291</li> <li>259,728</li> <li>269,499</li> <li>282,382</li> <li>239,491</li> <li>257,785</li> <li>256,711</li> <li>239,847</li> <li>273,471</li> <li>266,797</li> <li>260,308</li> </ul>	\$ 77,066 59,288 67,297 75,104 55,424 48,199 54,282 50,453 60,990 57,582 54,845	<ul> <li>\$ 222,225</li> <li>200,440</li> <li>202,202</li> <li>207,278</li> <li>184,068</li> <li>209,586</li> <li>202,428</li> <li>189,393</li> <li>212,481</li> <li>209,216</li> <li>205,463</li> </ul>	\$ 3,212 2,805 277 - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	\$ 6,092 4,784 - - 10,295 1,321 8,262 - 1,565 3,608 2,624	<ul> <li>\$ 231,529</li> <li>208,029</li> <li>202,479</li> <li>207,278</li> <li>194,363</li> <li>210,907</li> <li>210,690</li> <li>189,393</li> <li>214,046</li> <li>212,823</li> <li>208,087</li> </ul>			
June, 2015	265,255	50,772	214,484	-	2,861	217,345			
Total Contract Specification Paragraph 8.1.1.4 For Base Cost and Base Subsidy	\$ 3,170,565 s \$ 3,131,869	\$ 711,302 \$ 532,418	\$ 2,459,263 \$ 2,599,451	\$ 6,294	\$ 41,412	\$ 2,506,969			
Over (Under) Contract Requirements	\$ 38,696	\$ 178,884	\$ (140,188)						
	perating Costs Depreciation perating Costs	\$ 3,218,271 (516,492) \$ 2,701,779							
Farebox Ratio Actual	26.3%								
Farebox Ratio Contrac	t	17.0%							

	All First Transit Services Combined								
Date	Base Cost	Farebox	Net Subsidy	Fuel Escalator	Marketing	Net Cost and Total Paid to First Transit			
July, 2014 August, 2014 September, 2014 October, 2014 November, 2014 December, 2014 January, 2015 February, 2015 March, 2015 April, 2015 May, 2015	<ul> <li>\$ 372,879</li> <li>330,738</li> <li>340,496</li> <li>360,577</li> <li>304,758</li> <li>333,372</li> <li>327,169</li> <li>307,753</li> <li>349,103</li> <li>342,465</li> <li>330,818</li> </ul>	\$ 80,037 63,277 70,704 78,761 58,508 50,595 56,671 53,637 64,219 60,058 56,814	<ul> <li>\$ 452,916</li> <li>394,016</li> <li>411,200</li> <li>439,338</li> <li>363,266</li> <li>383,967</li> <li>383,840</li> <li>361,390</li> <li>413,322</li> <li>402,524</li> <li>387,632</li> </ul>	\$ 3,691 2,805 277 - - - - - - - - - - - - -	\$ 6,092 5,423 1,380 - 10,295 1,388 8,262 - 2,731 4,358 2,624	<ul> <li>\$ 462,699</li> <li>402,244</li> <li>412,857</li> <li>439,338</li> <li>373,561</li> <li>385,356</li> <li>392,102</li> <li>361,390</li> <li>416,053</li> <li>406,881</li> <li>390,256</li> </ul>			
June, 2015	339,703	54,760	394,463		2,861	397,324			
Total Combined Contract Specifications	\$ 4,039,833	\$ 748,041	\$ 4,787,874	\$ 6,773	\$ 45,414	\$ 4,840,061			
For Base Cost and Base Subsidy	\$ 4,048,114	\$ 586,977	\$ 3,461,137						
Over (Under) Contract Requirements	\$ (8,281)	\$ 161,064	\$ 1,326,736						
	perating Costs Depreciation perating Costs	\$ 4,092,020 (516,492) \$ 3,575,528							
Farebox Ratio Actual		20.9%							
Farebox Ratio Contrac	t	17.0%							